

\$2 A YEAR

50 CENTS A COPY

Volume XVI

Number 4

*The*  
**South Atlantic  
Quarterly**

EDITED BY  
W. H. GLASSON AND W. P. FEW

OCTOBER, 1917

CONTENTS

WHY WE ARE AT WAR . . . . .	289
OLIN D. WANNAMAKER	
THE CONTRACTING FIELD FOR INDIVIDUALISM . . . . .	303
NATHANIEL R. WHITNEY	
HORACE GREELEY AND THE SOUTH, 1865-1872 . . . . .	324
EARLE D. ROSS	
BRITISH PRAISE OF AMERICA . . . . .	339
H. HOUSTON PECKHAM	
SENSUOUSNESS IN THE POETRY OF MILTON AND KEATS . . . . .	346
WALTER GRAHAM	
THE FATHER OF THE WARTONS . . . . .	357
DAVID H. BISHOP	
BOOK REVIEWS . . . . .	369
NOTES AND NEWS . . . . .	379

DURHAM, N. C.

Founded by the "9019" of Trinity College

Entered May 3, 1902, as second-class matter, Postoffice at Durham, N. C.  
Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

# The South Atlantic Quarterly

Published at Trinity College, Durham, N. C., by the  
South Atlantic Publishing Company

## OFFICERS:

ROBERT L. FLOWERS, President  
WILLIAM K. BOYD, Vice President

WILLIAM H. GLASSON, Secretary  
FRANK C. BROWN, Treasurer

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

WILLIAM K. BOYD  
WILLIAM H. WANNAMAKER

WILLIAM H. GLASSON

ROBERT L. FLOWERS  
ALBERT M. WEBB

This journal was founded in January, 1902, in order to afford better opportunity in the South for the discussion of literary, historical, economic, and social questions. It knows no sectional jealousy and aims to offer a publishing medium in which respectful consideration will be accorded to all who have some worthy contribution to make in its chosen field. The Quarterly was originally established by the "9019," a society of young men of Trinity College, but it later passed into the control of the South Atlantic Publishing Company, Incorporated. It is under the joint editorship of Dr. W. H. Glasson and Dr. W. P. Few.

For their journal, the editors and publishers solicit the support of thinking people in all sections of the country and especially in the South. The subscription price is two dollars per year. Communications in regard to articles, book reviews, and editorial matters should be addressed to the Managing Editor, South Atlantic Quarterly, Trinity College, Durham, N. C. If the return of manuscripts not accepted is desired, the required postage should be enclosed. Subscriptions and all communications relating to advertisements and business matters should be addressed to the Treasurer, South Atlantic Quarterly, Durham, N. C.

## Contents of the Last Two Numbers:

### APRIL, 1917

My Recollections of William Garrott Brown.....	John Spencer Bassett
A New Epoch.....	William Thomas Laprade
American Trade-Promoting Activities.....	Paul S. Peirce
Some American War Poetry.....	E. E. Miller
The Novelty Fallacy in Literature.....	H. Houston Peckham
The Telegraph in the South, 1843-1850.....	R. S. Cotterill
Whitman and Masters: A Contrast.....	Julius W. Pratt
The Private Coinage of Gold Tokens in the South and West.....	B. W. Barnard
Professor Smith's O. Henry Biography.....	Edwin Mims
Classic Corfu: A War Station.....	H. Merian Allen
Book Reviews .....	
Notes and News .....	

### JULY, 1917

The Religion of the Kaiser.....	James G. Randall
Manual Labor Schools in the South.....	Edgar W. Knight
Walt Whitman to His Followers.....	Mary Hall Leonard
On the Death of Stonewall Jackson.....	Daniel Bedinger Lucas
The Effects of Bonds and Taxes in War Finance.....	Roy G. Blakey
The Black Codes.....	John M. Mecklin
The Open-Market Operations of the Federal Reserve Banks.....	R. M. Johnston
The First American Edition of the Lyrical Ballads.....	Earl L. Bradsher
The New Poetry.....	Julius W. Pratt
Book Reviews .....	
Notes and News .....	

ADVERTISEMENTS.

## TRINITY COLLEGE

Offers graduate and undergraduate courses in all departments of Literature, History, Science and Philosophy. Every advantage is offered and the best Christian influences are brought to bear in shaping character and preparing young men to meet the duties and responsibilities of life. The equipments are complete and the advantages are superior.

TRINITY COLLEGE HAS THE LARGEST  
ENDOWMENT OF ANY COLLEGE IN  
THE SOUTH ATLANTIC STATES. ♣ ♣

Lectures are from time to time delivered before the student body by men well equipped in their line of work. The students are kept in touch with the world's work, and those things are encouraged which develop men morally, mentally, and physically.

For catalogue and further information, address,

W. P. FEW, President, Durham, N. C.

---

## WHERE WILL YOU SEND YOUR BOY TO SCHOOL?

---

No parent will consider this question carelessly. A school should combine three qualities: 1. It should be a place where character is nurtured. 2. Where intellect is stimulated and properly trained. 3. Where health and good manners are promoted. : : : : : : : : : :

## THE TRINITY PARK SCHOOL

seeks to meet these requirements. It is a college preparatory school, thoroughly equipped for the best work in that line. It has six college trained teachers, seven buildings, modern in equipment, an excellent gymnasium, and unsurpassed library advantages. Students get all the benefits of college associations. For illustrated catalogue, address,

F. S. ALDRIDGE, Headmaster, - - Durham, North Carolina

ADVERTISEMENTS.

# J. SOUTHGATE & SON

## INSURANCE

DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA

B. N. DUKE, Pres.

J. F. WILT, Vice-Pres.

S. W. MINOR, Cashier

# The Fidelity Bank

Durham, North Carolina

The Capital of a bank, together with the Surplus and Profits, and the character and ability of the men who manage it, represent the protection afforded patrons.

Every person desires security for his money. This bank with its Capital and Surplus amounting to over \$500,000.00 and its able management affords greater protection than any other bank in Durham county.

YOUR ACCOUNT INVITED

## THE DURHAM & SOUTHERN RAILWAY

Offers the very best service to shippers and receivers of freight to and from Eastern, Western and Southern Points, and Durham, N. C., Apex, N. C., Dunn, N. C., and intermediate stations.

This Company also offers **Very Attractive Passenger Facilities and Schedules** to all points in the Southern States and Eastern points in North and South Carolina.

For further information apply to

**BURKE HOBGOOD,**

Soliciting Freight and Passenger  
Agent

DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA



---

---

# The Texas Review

Published Quarterly  
at  
The University of Texas

ROBT A. LAW, Editor

BURFORD O. BROWN, Business Manager

\$2.00 a Year

50c. a copy

---

---

---

---

## THE SURVEY

ONCE-A-MONTH EDITION

---

---

A *National* co-operative journal that links together efforts toward reform in all fields of social and civic progress. It reports the latest developments in

---

---

PLAY	VOCATIONAL TRAINING
PEACE	WIDOW'S PENSIONS
CHARITY	UNEMPLOYMENT
EDUCATION	MINIMUM WAGE
CITY PLANNING	CHILD LABOR
RURAL PROBLEMS	PROBATION
HEALTH PROBLEMS	STRIKES

---

---

SAMPLE COPIES FREE  
TWO DOLLARS A YEAR  
EIGHT MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

---

---

**SURVEY ASSOCIATES, INC.**

112 East 19th Street

New York, N. Y.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

# The Sewanee Review

QUARTERLY

*Issued in January, April, July, and October  
Each number consists of 128 large octavo pages, hand-  
somerly printed on heavy paper*

SUBSCRIPTION, \$2.00 A YEAR

*Single numbers, 50c.*

THIS REVIEW, established November 1892, under the auspices of the Faculty of the University of the South, is devoted to reviews of new and important books; to literary criticism; to papers on such topics of general literature as require fuller treatment than they receive in popular magazines and less technical treatment than they receive in specialist publications; and to discussions of vital questions in education, politics, economics, history, philosophy, art, science, and religion. In other words, THE REVIEW conforms more nearly to the type of the English Reviews than is usual with American periodicals. In policy it is not the organ either of an institution or of a church. Without being sectional, it seeks to represent fairly the best spirit of the South in its views on national problems and in its aspirations towards higher ideals.

Intending contributors and publishers desiring to have their important books reviewed will address as indicated below. Where the return of an article is desired, stamps should be enclosed. In all cases the full name of the contributor must be given, though it need not be published.

## The Sewanee Review

Sewanee, Tennessee

## The South Atlantic Quarterly

### Why We Are At War\*

OLIN D. WANNAMAKER

Professor of English, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas

Prior to the swift events of midsummer, 1914, which brought upon Europe the present unexampled catastrophe, three influences operative in American consciousness controlled our foreign policy, and any one of these influences seemed potent enough to keep us permanently aloof from European conflicts. First, we were a peace-loving nation; secondly, we adhered firmly to the Monroe Doctrine, and to its corollary—which chanced to antedate it historically—Washington's advice against European entanglements; thirdly, we were in a state of almost perfect mental neutrality as regards the great European Powers.

As a peace-loving nation, we had played a leading rôle in the endeavor to substitute the rule of reason for the rule of the bayonet in international relations, and our people were by no means entirely disillusioned as to the possibilities of this hopeful human movement. Rather, we looked forward optimistically to a time when war would have become obsolete as a method for settling controversies among nations of civilized mankind.

The Monroe Doctrine had been the means whereby we had guaranteed for nearly a century the independence of the weaker republics of the Americas; and we were not at all inclined to abandon this policy or to substitute another in its place. Realizing that any interference on our part in European affairs would greatly weaken the force of our veto upon attempted European aggression on this side of the Atlantic,

---

\* By special arrangement this article is published in both the *SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY* and the *Texas Review*.—THE EDITORS.

we had steadfastly refrained from such interference even when the sympathies of the nation had been harrowed by repeated outrages of the Turks against the Armenians, and when no European Power dared to intervene because of the peril of disturbing the balance of power. Our clash with Spain would never have occurred had Cuba been nearer to Europe than to America; indeed, it is extremely doubtful whether we could have been drawn into an offensive war against a European nation, with the risk of entanglements in that net of the balance of power, even in defence of a helpless American people, had not the spectacular sinking of the *Maine* fired the sudden passion of the population and forced the administration into war.

Lastly, we were mentally neutral toward the various members of the present contending alliances. Toward members of each alliance we had, indeed, strong reasons for friendship, but also toward most of these, strong reasons for standing aloof. Among the Central Powers, Austria was to our people a belated despotism, and for a despotism we had strong sentiments of disapproval. But in the opposing group Austria was balanced by Russia. We had befriended even an Asiatic Power against Russia in her latest war, and still more recently we had severed important treaty relations with Russia as a measure of our disapprobation of her policy toward the Jews. We remembered Germany's attitude of menace in our war with Spain, and entertained substantial suspicions as to her feelings toward us as a Great Power; but this resentment was neutralized by our long-standing grievances against Great Britain. Many of our people were as persistent in keeping these ancient grievances to the fore as if George III were still on the throne and our American liberties had not yet outgrown danger through British contrivance. Though we detested the Turkish régime in Europe, we felt more national concern as to the policies of Japan in the Orient. Finally as to France, it will certainly be admitted that our present pro-Gallic fervor is a birth out of the splendid heroism of the French during this war. Before this display had stirred our hearts, we had grown very cool in any enthusiasm felt by our ancestors concerning the debt we owed France for our own liberties.

To understand why these three potent restraining influ-

ences gave way before an almost universal national impulse which uprooted our national traditions and carried us into a great European conflict, we must note first of all the gradualness of this revolution in foreign policy. By this route shall we come also to a right analysis of our controversy with Germany.

During the diplomatic exchanges preliminary to the outbreak of hostilities, and still more clearly during the first weeks of the war, American sympathies began to range themselves somewhat on the side of the Entente Allies. Yet the nation as a whole still felt that this conflict was no concern of ours. Indeed, so indiscriminating were our comments upon the nations involved that some of our more discerning writers felt called upon to rebuke us sharply for failing to separate the aggressors from those suffering aggression. No statesman, however magnetic and influential, could have led America into the war during its first six months. Our national impulse to war was the result of the slow growth of more than two years.

Moreover, it was not the reaction to the climax of a series of insults and injuries done to ourselves. Germany and her allies were not alone in giving offense to our people. Some of us besides those of German descent were deeply resentful of British interference with our commerce and our mails and declared that the British blockade was utterly illegal and the British blacklist an outrage. Moreover, as regards Germany's violations of our rights, we in each case lived down our resentment, latterly our indignation and horror, and took no single step in the heat of passion. The breach in diplomatic relations was a deliberate step forced upon us by the logic of events, and the declaration of a state of war followed equally inevitably from events subsequent to the breach. In complete calmness of judgment the President became convinced of the moral impossibility of any other policy than one of war in conjunction with the Entente against Germany. In this calmly adopted conviction the President was supported by the people, whose conviction of the moral necessity of war ripened in like gradual manner.

But it is important for an understanding of our present position that we remember, not only that we acted with com-

mendable patience, but also that we did not determine upon war merely to vindicate our national rights, much less to exact penalties for past injuries. There might have been an element of cowardice in attacking Germany under all the circumstances were our cause for war merely national. There was no such unworthy element in determining upon war upon motives elevated above the assertion of national rights or revenge for national injuries. Such were our motives when we entered the war—and are to this day. Whatever may be the sentiment among the least thoughtful of the population, our leaders are certainly actuated by no spirit of reprisal. In reality our people have become inured to the injuries we have suffered at the hands of Germany. Our own wrongs have come to seem to us insignificant by comparison with the unutterable woes of all other nations engulfed in this war. Infringement of our own rights brought home to us the sufferings of other nations at the hands of Germany, and furnished the precise occasion needed to convince the most idealistic peace advocates among us that continued neutrality was a moral impossibility. The conviction of the American people, which is responsible for our participation in the world conflict, is the solemn belief that civilization is at stake: that civilization is incompatible with a victory of the Prussian régime. It was upon this belief that we entered the war.

To explain the state of the American national mind, it is, fortunately, unnecessary to assess the blame for the origin of the war. If such an analysis were the basis for our decision, we should be acting upon very uncertain ground. But we are willing to leave to future historians the unravelling of all the tangled threads of diplomacy and intrigue and misunderstanding which are directly and indirectly responsible for the terrible havoc of a world war. However strongly inclined many of us may be to attribute a major share of this terrible responsibility to Germany, that judgment of responsibility would not have been sufficient in itself to call our people to arms against one of the European combatants. We are convinced that civilization is imperilled by Germany, but not merely, nor even mainly, on the ground that we believe Germany chiefly responsible for the outbreak of war. That civiliza-

tion is imperilled by Germany we have been fully convinced by Germany herself since the outbreak of the war through the methods she has adopted in its prosecution. We have no hesitancy whatever in adjudging German methods in war as a blow at the very vitals of all international law, a deadly attack upon all humane relationships among nations.

For Germany has based her conduct of the war upon a principle disruptive and destructive of all moral law in the intercourse of peoples: the abhorrent principle that military necessity justifies any measure against an enemy. The victory of Germany would mean the establishment of this principle as a recognized element in international law—if there should, indeed, be any international law. No nation could, thenceforth, protest against warfare waged upon that principle. All that portion of international law which seeks to govern the conduct of belligerents toward their enemies and toward neutrals would have been abrogated by the will and the might of Germany, and future wars would be conducted according solely to the will and the might of the contending nations. Conduct of war would have become wholly anarchic.

That this is true becomes evident from a moment's reflection concerning the character of international law. This is merely a body of principles tacitly, or sometimes expressly, accepted by civilized nations,—promulgated by no parliament, interpreted by no court, enforced by no police. Upon so flimsy a structure rests the infinitely precious fabric of modern civilization. Let any Great Power defy a principle of international law and wage a victorious war by reason of that defiance, and that principle is thereby annulled. If it is a principle fundamental and basic, then its abrogation by the might of a great nation may involve the annulment of almost all international law, and the reversion of international conduct to the basis of the ages of barbarism. For this flimsy structure of international law is held intact by no bonds save the sense of mutual good faith and a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. If a Great Power scorns the opinions of mankind, and so acts that its good faith can no longer be relied upon, then no one but a simpleton will continue to entrust the safety of his nation to any other protection than sheer fighting power. A German

victory in the present war would be, in this manner, the annulment of vital factors in international law, the serious impairment of the whole structure of such law, and the enforcement upon all free peoples of immediate preparation for self-defensive war upon the present German methods.

Profoundly convinced of the justice of this view of the present world cataclysm, we were compelled to enter the great war: to refrain from sharing in the conflict would have been high treason to the cause of human liberty. A solemn obligation was thrust upon us: we have now to exert all our national power and shrink back from no sacrifice, however appalling, in order that the world may not revert to lawlessness; that the world may be saved for free peoples.

Will history uphold us in our view of this supreme crisis? If in the eyes of the German General Staff military necessity is really supreme over every other consideration in the conduct of war, then history will certainly not adjudge us to have overestimated the peril to civilization involved in a German victory. Victory thus achieved would mean the enthronement in the world of brute force. Is this terrible charge against the military leaders of Germany borne out by the facts? Consider certain crucial details in the history of the conflict.

Germany began the war with the invasion of Belgium, and her official explanation of the violation of the neutrality of Belgium, guaranteed by her together with other Powers, was the plea of military necessity: she must strike her enemies singly before they could combine against her. Having once for all sacrificed the national rights of Belgium to the god of German necessities, the General Staff has consistently followed the same principle throughout in the conduct of affairs in Belgium. Invaded of necessity, Belgium must of necessity be held. In order that it might be held with the least peril to the invading army, the population must be overawed and terrorized. Hence a few shots by snipers in the city of Louvain was followed by the burning of the historic city. (To weigh the meaning of the principle of military necessity contrast the conduct of the American expeditionary force when snipers fired upon it for several days in Vera Cruz.) Necessity has dictated from the beginning the harshest treatment to civilians in Belgium.



Necessity, perfectly and consistently logical, has revived practices from earlier ages and fined enormously cities in Belgium which were not utterly subservient to German authority. Military necessity—the necessity of holding prisoners with the least difficulty—dictated directly from Berlin the execution of an English Red Cross nurse on the charge of aiding a few Belgian wounded prisoners to escape. As necessity has grown more and more pressing the action of the German régime has grown more and more severe, until it has culminated in the forced deportation of many thousands of able-bodied Belgians into Germany to be employed in labor in order that Germans might be released for the battle front. It is not necessary to charge Germany with the use of these Belgians in the digging of trenches or other directly military duties. The manner in which they were assembled and taken away from their country and their families was in keeping with the principle to which appeal was probably, though not publicly, made in justification of the measure. Scenes were enacted all over prostrate Belgium which cause the hearts of all humane men to bleed. This measure dictated by military necessity is a revival of slavery in a form utterly revolting to human nature.

The same abhorrent doctrine, with the same abhorrent results, has obviously been invoked by Germany in her methods of warfare on land, by sea, and from the air. Her navy has done little else than to bombard defenseless towns along the east coast of England under cover of darkness, hurling explosive shells into these sleeping towns, not in the expectation of any direct military result, but solely to terrorize the population. The logic of this procedure is simple and flawless: it was necessary that Germany win the war; to terrorize England might break the spirit of the English, keep many soldiers out of France, and hasten the end of hostilities. Therefore she adopted the policy of bombarding sleeping towns at night. In the same spirit of thorough adherence to the logic of her foundation principle, she has sent her great galleons of the air to drop tons of explosives on sleeping cities, regardless of the impossibility of selecting for destruction only objects of a military character and regardless of the slaughter of women and children by this method of warfare. The cessation of Zepp-

lin attacks upon England was not the indication of a change of heart on the part of the General Staff. This barbarous method of fighting ceased to be a military necessity as soon as the returns proved less than the expenditures. The method failed and was abandoned. Human considerations did not enter into the question.

The same principle, no doubt, completely justified in the eyes of Germany's military chieftains the use of poisonous gases in trench warfare. It was necessary that Germany drive her enemies out of their trenches or kill them there. Poisonous gases were believed likely to prove effectual to this end, provided the wind would blow right. Doubtless *unser Gott* would see to it that the wind did mostly blow right!

That Germany has not seen a new light, nor abandoned the doctrine of military necessity is demonstrated by the condition of French territory evacuated by her armies. Our ambassador to France testified after a hundred-mile trip through this part of France, that probably no army ever devastated territory so utterly as the German army devastated this region of France in this Christian year 1917. Not only were towns and villages dynamited, burned, and levelled with the ground: this might conceivably be palliated as the defensive measure of a retreating army. But self-defense has extended its plea to very great lengths when it dictates the cutting down of all the orchards of the region, orchards that it will require thirty and forty years to grow again. Surely the world cannot allow the military necessity of being able to see one's enemy from the sky in summer to justify the destruction of the source of food for a whole unborn generation. Was the cutting of the orchards really ordered for that purpose, or to impress upon France for the future the dire penalty of rousing the wrath of the Germans? And what explanation can be offered for the removal of all the population of many towns and villages into Germany? If it was to spare these people from the peril of the artillery when their ruined villages should fall between the retreating and pursuing army, why, then, did the German army carefully leave behind every mother with a child under fifteen years of age? As to the charges of brutal treatment of women during the German occupation of these French towns—charges made

by eminently respectable persons—we prefer to await a calmer time before determining whether military necessity actually produced this conduct as one of its by-products. One must, however, be pardoned for remembering in this connection the words of farewell addressed by the Kaiser seventeen years ago to his troops embarking for China to relieve the legations beleaguered in Peking by the Boxers. When German troops on this expedition, after the successful rescue of the legations, made expeditions into the surrounding countryside and terrorized the villages, treating with nameless brutality helpless Chinese women, they were but living up to the spirit of their sublime sovereign's command. He had ordered them to show no mercy, to grant no quarter, so to impress with dread the Chinese that no Chinaman for half a century would dare to look even sidewise into the face of a German. One of the characteristics of the principle of military necessity is its far-sightedness.

The clash between Germany and the United States arose out of Germany's conduct of her submarine warfare, and it is just here that the principle of military necessity as applied by the General Staff reached its climax. For the sea is the highway of all nations, and the abrogation of the laws of sea warfare strikes directly at the liberties of all nations alike. Whatever may be said against the sort of blockade which England enforced against Germany, two things can be said in its favor: it was legal, according to precedent; and its enforcement did not cause the sinking of a single ship or the sacrifice of a single life. The German blockade, on the other hand, is new to warfare, and its enforcement necessitates the sinking of inconceivable values in ships, and the destruction of unimaginable quantities of merchandise sorely needed by the human race. It involves also the reckless sacrifice of human lives, of belligerents and neutrals alike. It may be compared—to place great and small together for the moment—with the use of unrestricted violence by striking laborers. No matter what the merits of their case, nor what the exasperation they have suffered at the hands of capital, the public cannot permit the striking laborers to destroy vast quantities of useful commodities, much less to kill recklessly many innocent citizens. On

the score of the impoverishment of the world alone, even were human life not savagely taken, the German use of the submarine could not be tolerated by mankind. But, based upon the principle that military necessity justifies any measure effectual against an enemy, it knows no limit in its horror and brutality. It abrogates every consideration of a human and moral nature. It does not merely keep back food from the enemy, until he shall succumb and surrender: it destroys the food of the human race, and slays the innocent at sea.

What will be the result of the operation of this principle of military necessity if Germany is victorious through her submarine warfare? Every free nation must forthwith build a vast fleet of submarines, and must train thousands of its young men to become expert assassins at sea. For no nation could be otherwise assured of its ability to maintain its independence. No solemn guarantee against the future use of the submarine to destroy neutral commerce and neutral lives would avail to assure the world, for Germany would be the dominant Power, and she would have become dominant by reason of the setting aside of a solemn treaty and the violation of solemn articles of international law. No restriction could any longer be placed upon the use of the submarine or any other still more horrible contrivance of science for the destruction of life. Eternal vigilance would, indeed, have become, in a direful sense, the price of liberty. Every nation would, of necessity, arm to the teeth.

Let it be repeated, then, as the thesis of this paper, that we have undertaken to combat with all our material and human resources and at any sacrifice Germany's use of the submarine, not because the submarine has been responsible for the loss of American lives, much less because it has defied our national rights. We might conceivably have refrained from war even over a question fundamental to present national rights and over the loss of a certain number of American lives, incidental as these things seem to the vast sweep of this world war. But we could not refrain from war when we saw that to do so would be clearly to betray the rights of unborn generations of children and the sacred future of the human race. We could not consent to see another Dark Ages settle down over the world. If the addition of our power and our sacrifice to those

of the Entente Allies can prevent such a catastrophe, the race shall not wait for a hundred years to restore even the imperfect civilization of the year 1914. Germany herself has wholly convinced us that at this juncture the Allies are the custodians of the happiness of mankind, and that the German General Staff is the enemy of the human race. We are waging war in behalf of humanity.

We are not, then, seeking to inflict punishment for offenses done either to ourselves or to others. Least of all do we desire to do hurt permanently to the German population. Our eyes are not upon the past, but upon the future, and what we seek is the assurance that such crimes against humanity shall not soon be repeated, nor ever repeated, if this can be prevented. We seek to establish foundations for a lasting peace. We, together with all men, look far beyond the determining of just penalties against guilty men or governments for the horrors of this present war, toward some plan whereby humanity shall be freed wholly from the incubus of war. Should our great Republic and the free peoples of Europe after immeasurable sacrifices in treasure and blood and at the cost of unimaginable human suffering, yet fail to lay the foundations for a century of peace and for the gradual complete abolishment of war, this struggle will have proved only a vast tragedy, a Calvary of the race with no redemption as its purchase for the world. Apart from the earnest prosecution of our share of the war, we must focus attention upon the ultimate objective: the end of war.

What hope is there of so great an achievement? Have we any means adequate to such an end?

First, as to the means. It has become evident to all men that universal peace can never be attained otherwise than through some form of universal police ready and able to carry into effect the decrees of a concert of peoples. No matter how severely Germany may be defeated, such a league will be sorely needed after this war. So virile and so determined a people can never be permanently crushed—and to crush the population of Germany would be a great injury to the world. Defeat in this war will leave rankling wounds to serve the military party in Germany and furnish a rallying cry for preparation

for future revenge. A prepared Germany will again mean a prepared Europe, and this time a prepared America as well. To prevent the waste of billions of dollars in constantly increasing military preparation and to give such a sense of security as will enable nations to go about their normal activities and to devote their wealth and energies to sorely needed internal reforms, to humanize government and society, it is essential that a league be organized strong enough to enforce the human demand for peace. No other remedy for the horrors of militarism has been proposed which bears the stamp of practicality. A league of nations must prepare to wage war against war if the nations are to be diverted from waging wars against one another. No matter how great the difficulties involved, no matter how conflicting the national interests to be harmonized, no matter what terrible risks we run in assuming a full share in the effort to realize this dream of world peace, the dream is so essential of realization for the future of the race that we must not hesitate to take the great adventure for its sake.

Cannot the present group of democratic peoples be made into such a league? Whether Germany should be welcomed into its membership or not will depend upon the form of government controlling Germany at the close of the war, but, with or without Germany, cannot the peace of the world be insured by England, France, Russia, Japan, Italy, and the United States? It appears most unlikely that wholly economic and commercial considerations will rise of sufficient moment to cause a rupture among these Powers. If one of the cardinal principles in the constitution of the league shall be the just treatment of small or backward peoples, then aggressions by any one of these Powers upon a weaker nation would be the cause, not for a rupture between that Power and some other Power, but between that Power and the whole league. In other words, the police force of the league would be called out to enforce just treatment of the weaker nation. The sole obstacle that could prevent the coöperation of this great group of nations in a harmonious league would be the unsatisfied desire of some one or more of their number for space on the surface of the earth in which to expand. Japan might well consider the influence of the league far from impartial if it operated to con-

firm Britain in her vast holdings in all quarters of the globe while Japan, aspiring to the position of the Britain of the Orient is restricted to a territory inadequate for her population. Some adjustments would have to be made to give to the nations constituting the league a sense of justice and of mutuality in the peace guarantees of the organization of Powers. But surely, for so great an end, the nations can discover and will make such adjustments.

If such a league were assured, could the Allies consent to end the war with autocracy still regnant in Germany? Such a policy would be inviting disaster to the league. If Germany were outside the league, her endeavor for the coming half century would be to disrupt the league, and her activities would most probably succeed in sowing fatal discord in its ranks. The permanent functioning of the league may very well be expected if it can be made to function for fifty years, but discord sown among the members during the first half century might well prove the destruction of the league and the postponement of world peace for another century. A Germany outside the league must be democratic. But a democratic Germany outside the league would be an anomaly, and to insist upon a democratic Germany as a condition precedent to ending this war would be doubly to guarantee the firm establishment of the league. It would be to remove from the governments of the world an autocratic trouble-maker, and to avoid alienating the German people from the objects of the league. The Hohenzollerns must go, and they must have no successors.

But, after all, what we have called the ultimate objective of our entry into the war is only a means to a more vital end. The utmost that can be accomplished by even an ideally effective league for peace will be to give to every nation the opportunity to bring freedom to realization among its own people. In all nations there are plague spots on the body of civilization. With an assured peace we shall merely have freed ourselves from outside engrossments in order that we may deal earnestly with these foul blemishes upon civic and national life. Pressing problems confront every nation. Pressing problems confront us. Radical reconstruction in economic and social conditions is the lowest price at which we shall ever purchase true freedom:

freedom for all men within our borders, freedom for all women, freedom for all children. We are very far from actualizing that doctrine we hold theoretically so dear: for all men, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To very many of our people we have insured at best only life, without liberty and with no chance whatever for the pursuit of happiness. For many others we have not even insured life itself. Our hope is that the league for peace, like the great dykes of Holland, may keep back from every nation the engulfing tides of war, in order that every nation, behind that secure and permanent rampart, may develop true freedom for every citizen, and thus at length a true union of hearts for all the people.



## The Contracting Field for Individualism

NATHANIEL R. WHITNEY

Assistant Professor of Economics in the State University of Iowa

It will seem a commonplace to the student of economic history to say that in the relations of men in industrial society there has been a struggle constantly between individualism and socialism, using the latter word in its most general sense. The conflict has not always been clearly defined; the words individualism and socialism have had, from time to time, a different content; and the great majority of men have not usually been conscious that they were living through and participating in such a contest; but, however interpreted, and whether understood or not, this has been the real nature of the forces which have been molding social relations and institutions now in one form and again in another.

If we draw on our scant knowledge of primitive peoples we note the transition from an individual economy, in which each supplied his own wants as far as possible, to a social alliance, for economic purposes, which took the form of a gens, a tribe, a clan, or a family. In more modern times the enlarging boundaries of the economic unit include, first, the manor, then the district—made up of the manors and the town—next the nation, and now the world. This suggests a steadily progress from an individual to a social economy, but the real course has not been so smooth and uninterrupted as this. There have been numerous halts in the march, as when nations adopting the mercantilistic philosophy and the nationalistic point of view sought to make themselves by means of protective tariffs and other restrictive devices almost completely self-dependent. There has even been retracement of steps at times, as, for example, when, during the latter part of the eighteenth century, the *laissez faire* philosophy impressed men as having a natural or divine approval. But, in spite of these delays, there can be no doubt in the mind of one who takes a bird's-eye view of the whole sweep of human history that the trend has been steadily away from individualism. This knowledge gives the modern

socialist, and not without reason, his confidence in the inevitability of socialism.

As pilgrims participating in this never-ending crusade, which has been on the march since the earliest days of man, we are so shut in by the crowd about us that we are for the most part conscious only of the difficulties of the road and of our immediate surroundings. We pass new landmarks but they give us little idea as to our goal or the direction we are taking. This paper is designed to set up a few observation posts, from which we can look back over the road we have travelled and forward to the head of the column to see whither we are going.

The first aim of our observation will be to determine direction. Are we actually headed away from individualism, and, if so, how far from it have we departed?

That our steps are directed away from individualism is scarcely open to question. As soon as we raise our eyes from immediate surroundings and see our isolated experiences and observations in relation to other facts and experiences, we find that we have all been observing the same changes without realizing that these joint observations of changing conditions indicate pretty accurately the direction in which we are moving.

Students, especially in the allied fields of political science, sociology and economics, have been more and more conscious that the field for individualism is constantly narrowing. The clearest evidence in political science is found in the widening of the term "public service" and the rapid enlargement of the "police power" as these are manifested in legislative enactment and judicial decision. There has been a constant and rapidly increasing tendency to bring under public control businesses which formerly were regarded as strictly of private concern. Some businesses, such as railroading, have long been regarded of special concern to the public, and, although they are owned by private individuals, their actions have been circumscribed by state authority. There is, then, nothing new in calling these public utilities and the service they perform a public service. But consider how this control has broadened even in the railroad business from a mere formal supervision to the detailed and constant control exercised by the Interstate

Commerce Commission. Now the railroads are required to keep their accounts in a prescribed manner; reports must be filed when demanded; even the number of men to be employed on the train is sometimes specified; the number of hours employees may work is limited; and the rates to be charged for service are fixed by public authority. Could public interference with private property go further than this without actual expropriation?

And the railroads are not alone in this class. One after another various private businesses have been brought under the regulations established by society in its own interest. As early as 1876, the Supreme Court in upholding a law which fixed the prices to be charged for storage in a grain elevator expressed the idea which now generally prevails when it said: "Property becomes clothed with a public interest when used in a manner to make it of public consequence and affect the community at large. When, therefore, one devotes his property to a use in which the public has an interest, he in effect grants to the public an interest in that use, and must submit to be controlled by the public for the common good to the extent of the interest he has thus created."

The theory has long been accepted that when a business, even though privately owned, becomes intimately connected with the public so that it has the possibility of affecting for good or ill the public weal, such private business must submit to control by the people which it serves. The idea is not new, but the significant fact from the present point of view is the great number and variety of businesses which we are putting into this class of public servants. Within the last generation the charges of ferries, grist-mills, gas and electric lighting plants, telegraphs, stockyards, street railways, and telephones have been fixed by various legislatures. As a society we have been constantly reaching out and taking under our control the property of private individuals. Not only the property but even the formerly sacred private rights of individuals are invaded under the aegis of the public welfare. It need only be shown with sufficient clearness that the interest of society is involved and immediately the right of the individual becomes of little weight. Vaccination, sanitation, and other prophy-

lactic measures illustrate in common experience the extent to which social interest dominates our thoughts to the disparagement of the old theories concerning individual rights and privileges.

This tendency to contract the field for individualism through legal enactment or administrative control has even changed the aspect of political philosophy. In his presidential address to the American Political Science Association, Professor W. W. Willoughby sets forth so clearly this growing control of society over the individual that his views merit consideration in this connection at some length.

Professor Willoughby says that the relation of the individual to the state has been viewed in four aspects—the Hellenic, the Oriental, the Individualistic, and the Modern. In the Hellenic political theory, since man was regarded as a social being, life in a state of society with its restrictions was not an interference with original independence but a condition of life necessary to his very existence as a rational being. Hence it followed that while the individual might be said to have many rights he had none which could be opposed to the state.

In the Oriental philosophy the individual was subordinated wholly to the state. There was subjection—obedience due to an external power. The Oriental government of the universe was transcendental.

The Individualistic theory of the relation between man and the state was the outgrowth of the philosophy of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; it was one of the products of the Protestant Reformation. The individual was not bound to unquestioned obedience to any external authority. Such political authority as was recognized was derived, it was said, from the individuals subject to it.

In the modern or idealistic view of the state, the two ideas of absolute freedom and absolute subjection are harmonized. The individual realizes himself in the outer world by utilizing objective forces and institutions for securing the development and perfection which is his aim. He therefore subjects himself to the state because it comprehends most of the forces needed for highest self-realization. Hegel thus speaks of the state as the "embodiment of concrete freedom." To quote Dr. Wil-

loughby, "In so far as the commands of a social or political power are recognized by the individual as necessary for the realization of his own best good, which . . . includes the good of others, such commands no longer appear to him as orders from an external power limiting his freedom, but rather as imperatives addressed to himself by his own reason. In obeying them, therefore, he obeys, in fact, himself. . . . These conclusions . . . carry with them the logical corollary that no *a priori* limits may be placed upon the state's sphere of control. Each and every exercise of political control is to be justified by the results reached, or reasonably expected to be reached, by it; and the worth of these results is to be measured by the degree to which they contribute to that highest social goal which is but a statement, in social terms, of the several goals of the individual members of the group."

"The practice of modern states clearly shows the acceptance of this utilitarian conception of the proper province of political control—that the state and its government are made for man and not man for the state, and that all political agencies exist as means to an end and not as ends in themselves. This broadening of the sphere of public authority is shown not only in the assumption by the state of the ownership and operation of public utilities, and in the increased regulation of these undertakings when they remain in private hands, but, in general, in the state's efforts to advance, through the exercise of its police powers, the physical, moral and esthetic welfare, as well as the economic and industrial prosperity of its citizens. Finally, and most recent, and in some ways the most significant of all, are the efforts which the civilized states of the world are making to secure in some ways a more just distribution of economic burdens and benefits than is realized or realizable under a régime of unrestricted competition."

This tendency to limit the individual's control over his private property in the effort of society to attain a certain social ideal is well illustrated in the philosophy underlying workmen's compensation laws. These laws provide for the payment of definite sums of money to injured workmen without regard to fault upon the part of the person making the payment. This amounts "to the taking of the property of one individual and

handing it to another, not as a result of an expressed or implied contract, nor as damages for a tort, but because it is deemed socially expedient and just that the burden of the injury be shifted from the shoulders of him upon whom it first falls, to the shoulders of another."

This marks the adoption of the general theory of the socialists that no *a priori* limitations growing out of the nature of political authority can be used to prevent the state from doing what it can to secure the true interests of its people. The individual's rights to life, liberty and property have, however, in this country, been so fully guaranteed by constitutional provisions that it would seem that some of the most recent extensions of interference with the actions or property of individuals would be barred. But this expansion in legal reasoning has been accomplished through a broadening of the police power of the state.

To what extent can this power be invoked to curb private action in the handling of the individual's own property? There seems to be no assignable limit except the clear desire of the public. Even mere convenience to the public has been regarded as sufficient justification for the regulation of private rights. It seems clear from the foregoing that political science furnishes us with evidence to show that the direction of our march is away from individualism and toward some form of collective action, and the landmarks which we are leaving behind are designated "private property," "vested interests," "freedom of contract," and "*laissez faire*."

Sociologists also attest the correctness of this judgment. Their terminology, their very science, indicates a consciousness that there is need for the study not of individuals as such but of their relations to one another; not of the laws governing individual action but of those influencing social action. In their every word sociologists give evidence of a recognition of the fact that a social body is being created, with great complexity and great interdependence of parts, which is of more significance for present-day study and observation than are the actions or thoughts of the individual members of the social body. Such terms as social psychology, the social mind, social consciousness, social ethics, even social religion, indicate

very clearly that our caravan is getting into a new region. Professor Giddings speaks of the social mind as a concrete thing—the product of the closer association and interdependence of people in society. This social mind is more than any individual mind and dominates every individual will.

Not only in his use of terms but especially in his advocacy of various social reforms the sociologist shows that he is consciously observing and participating in this movement which indicates a steadily contracting field for the individualist. Whether it be the regulation of the liquor traffic, the demand for the regulation of marriage in the interest of eugenics, the establishment of vaccination or quarantine rules, compulsory education, compulsory contribution for poor relief, or any of the great variety of social reforms—the assumption is involved that when the interests of society and of the individual conflict, the latter are not entitled to much consideration. And the sociologist thus notes, as does the economist, that the field for social control is constantly widening, that many things are to-day regarded as of concern to society which were formerly not so regarded, and therefore that the field within which the individual can operate unfettered is growing constantly smaller.

If we confine our attention more strictly to economic affairs we see the reason for this change in the social and political ideal. There is little place for individualism in the efforts to satisfy the wants of mankind. In primitive life the individual was an efficient producing unit—he satisfied his simple wants unaided. Gradually, however, he realized the advantages of association and coöperation, and with the further expansion of desires these advantages have been more and more patent until now production is almost entirely a social process. Work has been so specialized and subdivided that it is rare for an individual to produce any of the things he desires for his own consumption, and it is practically unknown for any one to produce all of the things he wants. There is a two-fold reliance on society—that it, the market, will accept the goods produced by the individual, and that the same society will, through some of its members, furnish the things to satisfy the desires of the individual.

And there is further dependence on society in the act of

production itself. In almost every act of production the individual must rely on others to furnish him with the raw materials, the tools and machines, at least a part of the working capital, and part of the labor. He cannot hire a laborer or sell a commodity without affecting to some extent wages and prices throughout the whole community. The division of labor, large-scale production, the development of transportation and means of communication, all have conspired to bring about the enlargement of the economic unit from the individual to society, as the result of which the welfare of each individual has come to depend more and more on the actions of other persons or groups in the social organization.

The advent and extension of capitalism which seems to epitomize individualism and to give existence to that most frequently obnoxious of individualists, the capitalist, paradoxically has been one of the most potent influences working toward a limitation of the field for individualism. This occurs in two ways. First, the more dependent we become on capitalistic methods of production, the more we realize the necessity of assuming a considerable degree of control over the agent of production which has the possibility of affecting so powerfully the welfare of society. The very growth and strength of capitalism emphasizes both the potential and actual dangers of individualism. Second, the extension of capitalism has been partly the cause and partly the effect of large-scale industry. The investment opportunities afforded by large industries have stimulated the accumulation and use of capital, and in turn the increase in the supply of capital has made possible the enlargement of the business unit. The many advantages obtained through large-scale production have led to rapid expansion of the business unit which in turn has made it necessary to absorb capital from many sources. The development of the corporate form of organization with the division of interest into many small and separable shares has likewise been both cause and effect of the growth of capitalism and the expansion in the size of the business unit. Many individuals not only in one town or in one nation, but throughout the whole world thus participate as owners and managers in the industrial affairs of distant towns and other nations. Industry has in turn outgrown the individ-



ual, the family, and the group, and is now rapidly losing its exclusively national character. The capital which is needed to make possible this growth of industrial units, being attracted from all sources, serves to furnish a common interest in productive efforts, no matter where they are put forth.

Capitalistic production leans inevitably toward internationalism in spite of the occasional rivalries and jealousies which threaten to make permanent antagonists of nations. International financial and credit relations thus represent a movement toward socialism and away from individualism. So little do nations now exist as individuals in isolation that any industrial or financial disturbance in one is felt immediately in all of the others with which it has relations. This growing financial solidarity was shown during the crisis of 1907 and 1908 which affected chiefly the United States and Germany. But the nations competing with them, such as England and France, suffered almost as much. Professor Rathgen in his American lectures a few years ago commented on this international financial dependence and showed how the foreign trade and industrial prosperity of Germany is immediately affected by business conditions in the United States and other countries. Every country is not only producer and rival but is also consumer and customer. It is generally agreed that this economic interdependence was one of the principal influences which prevented the outbreak of war between Germany and France when the trouble in Morocco was ended by the Algeciras conference.

The elaborate financial interdependence throughout the world has grown up in spite of ourselves, and without our noticing it. No nation lives for itself alone, nor can it conduct its business affairs without regard for others. As Norman Angell says in *The Great Illusion*, this interrelation of the various countries leads them to meet their financial obligations honestly, for when they have once been drawn into the circle of international trade and finance they find repudiation of their debts the least profitable form of theft. Such repudiation and the injury thus inflicted upon other nations would react upon the dishonest country with cumulative effect.

The same social tendency is manifested in the domain of public finance. Every one is familiar with the many new objects

for which public money is being expended: parks, playgrounds, schools, colleges, public health, mothers' pensions, and model tenements. All of these indicate a recognition on the part of society of the fact that the well-being of every unit in the group is a matter of such general concern that it is worth while to promote it by contributions from the public purse. Our modern theories of taxation likewise reflect this tendency. The weight of the tax burden on the individual is, in general, adjusted to his capacity; those who have little or no surplus are freed as far as possible from the burden, even though they may be the chief beneficiaries of the expenditure to be made. Some of the more recent tendencies in taxation manifest frankly the purpose of equalizing so far as possible the benefits and burdens of life. The public expenditures are constantly bringing to individuals goods, and services, and opportunities that they could never afford for themselves, and since the state has no funds of its own it calls upon its more fortunate citizens to pay for these benefits. The taxation of inheritances, and of incomes, and in fact the whole principle of progression has as its justification the feeling that society is a unit and that the individual has no divine right even to what might be called his private property if the welfare of society demands that some of his wealth be taken away from him and given to others.

It goes without saying that the narrowing of the field for individualism is not occurring without bitter opposition on the part of those who cherish individualism as a sort of religion. Such opponents may be divided into three main classes: (1) the ignorant and thoughtless; (2) those who have some vested interests or who are influenced by selfish considerations; and (3) those who honestly, but mistakenly, hold fast to a philosophy of individualism.

Ignorance and thoughtlessness account for the attitude of the great majority of those who oppose the advance of socialism, using this word as the antithesis of individualism. It is to be expected that the great majority of people should fail to see beneath the surface. They are for the most part so completely immersed in their own petty affairs that either they are unconscious of the miseries and evils under which their fellow-men groan, or, seeing these conditions, their under-

standing of cause and effect is so limited that they do not realize that the cause of most of these evils is too much reliance on individualism and that the remedy must be sought in some form of social action.

Take the problem of poverty, for example. This arises from various causes, the chief of which are designated by Hollander as under-payment, unemployment, industrial accidents, and illness. The existence of each of these causes is made possible in part by the selfishness or lack of consideration of one individual for another and the remedy lies in checking the power of the unsocial individual. Hence, we have labor organizations, minimum wage laws, public employment bureaus, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, and health insurance.

Not only is the responsibility for the conditions which breed poverty social but the penalty is a social one also, for the social organization pays finally in one form or another. Our huge expenditures from the public treasury for the prevention and cure of tuberculosis and other contagious or infectious diseases, for the care of the insane, the paupers, and the criminals, for the maintenance of a police force and a judicial system, to say nothing of the incalculable private contributions of money and services which might be otherwise employed—all attest the fact that society cannot dodge the penalty of its neglect but must eventually pay in one form or another. The remedies suggested from time to time all recognize the existence of a social interest which overshadows the interest of any individual. The advocate of minimum wage legislation denies that the individual employer has the right to hire his labor for any wage that such labor can be forced to accept. He maintains that if the laborer is not paid a proper wage, not only that individual but the whole social body suffers, and therefore it is not only the interest of the individual but also that of society which must be taken into account. The single taxer would remove all individual handicaps by appropriating for social use the annual rent of land. The advocate of the confiscation of large estates through a progressive inheritance tax assumes that theories as to the property rights of individuals merit little consideration when balanced against the needs and

well-being of society as a whole. The socialist goes farther and suggests a complete subordination of the individual to society.

All this seems plain enough when attention is called to it, but the reason for the opposition to many needed reforms which shows itself on the part of a large number of people is that their attention has not been called to the matter and that they are too ignorant or thoughtless to understand the situation properly for themselves. This ignorance or thoughtlessness prevails in all classes of society but it is especially characteristic of those who themselves are neither in want nor in fear of want. Persons in this class are apt to exalt individualism—it contributes to their self-esteem. The mind works in about this manner,—the success and prosperity of each individual depends upon himself; if a man is successful it is because he has more than ordinary ability; I am prosperous and successful; therefore, the conclusion is obvious.

The owner of a large manufacturing establishment, in speaking recently about the "presumptuous" demands of his workmen, said: "These men get all they are worth; what I get I am entitled to; if any of them had my ability and I had theirs our positions would be reversed and I would be working for them." Such a view is always superficial and ill-informed, but it was especially so in this case because this particular apostle of individualism had not built up his business, and therefore had not earned his position, but had inherited it from his father.

It is naturally to be expected that some of the bitterest opposition to this clipping of the wings of individualism should come from those who have vested interests which they fear the spread of socialism may disturb. Among those who have large tracts of agricultural land, valuable city sites, large investments in railroads, banks, public utilities and industrial corporations, the doctrines of socialism get scant welcome. This is what we would expect to find among these large vested interests, for it is hardly likely that those favored few who enjoy many privileges which are out of the reach of most people should be very eager to yield any part of their advantage. But the more hurtful opposition comes from that much larger number of small

fry who own their homes, or who possess a few shares of stock or a few thousand dollars worth of bonds, and perhaps an automobile. They live in relatively simple, though comfortable manner; their larder is filled satisfactorily enough even when prices reach prohibitive levels for the great body of workers; their children dress well, are given the advantages of complete school and college training, and their entry into the better grades of wage work, the professions, or even into business on a small scale is made comparatively easy. These people are smug and content with the existing order which has prospered them so well. The indifference or hostility of this group interposes a more difficult barrier to surmount not only because the members of the group are more numerous than those having large vested interests but especially because the opposition might be regarded as unexpected or even treacherous. The fact that these persons who are apparently so slightly removed from the group which needs social action to assure its well-being are apparently satisfied with individualism and sniff with skepticism at the suggestion of greater socialization, makes many of the lower group feel somewhat uncertain as to the feasibility or desirability of a program to which many people of nearly the same social standing are opposed. The field for individualism would be considerably narrowed if all these persons could be driven out into the open and induced to admit frankly that they are individualists because of purely selfish considerations.

The opposition to a further contraction of the field for individualism which pretends most is that based on an outworn philosophy. According to these defenders of the faith the trend toward socialism must be checked if the vigor, self-reliance, and self-expression of the people are to be maintained. Men will not exert their best efforts, so they say, unless there is some incentive such as wealth or power to be obtained in repayment for the effort. These persons divest themselves of any selfish interest in the movement and advance to defend individualism from the lofty ground of abstract reasoning. The words "right" and "justice" and "ambition" and "discipline" and "human development" are the terms used to conjure with.

One of the best examples of an adherence to such oppo-

sition to the spread of social control over private property is furnished in an article entitled, *The Railroads and the People*, which was published recently in the *Yale Review*. The author, James O. Fagan, a railroad signalman, is a pronounced individualist and an opponent of the organization of railroad workers. In this article he objects to the extension of public control over the railroads and indicts the whole public which has brought about this control in the following words: "I now say to the people of this country that as a would-be regulator of railroad systems and railroad workers, you have made a dreadful mess of it. You have been working on the socialistic and political supposition that you have a right to claim, own, and manage something that has been bought and paid for by somebody else. You are very much mistaken. Nowadays even society must be just to its units before it is generous to its mass. Neither social nor political expediency is fundamental. Right and justice are the real issues."

Here we might pause to interpose the query, What is meant by right and justice; justice as applied to whom? Mr. Fagan is thinking of justice to the comparatively few individuals who own and manage the railroads. But is justice to a few individuals to outweigh the demands for justice on the part of the much larger social body? After all, in spite of Mr. Fagan's denial, is not social expediency fundamental?

The writer goes on pouring out his futile wrath upon an impervious public—"You seem to be getting it into your head that industrial patriotism should call upon the private citizen to sink his money in public service corporations, never to see it again. . . . Industrially speaking, you have always been a coward. You have never been willing to take any risks. You never had any use for telegraphs, telephones, railroads, monitors, or submarines in their infancy. True, you have always encouraged the private investors in these old-time insecurities by granting them the free use of the air, the earth and the sea in which to perfect their inventions. But now when your so-called public utility can be worked on a security basis, you are getting an itch to go into the business yourself. You want to share in the profits of business you never created."

What is the result of this selfish and mistaken policy on

the part of society? Mark well the gravity of the situation! He says: "In the first place, for example, you have lost the respect and patriotic consideration of railroad managers all over the country . . . Among railroad people of highest patriotism and integrity, this feeling of bitterness against you and your confiscating policy is practically unanimous. And the feeling is not confined to the railroads."

In this article Mr. Fagan speaks with bitterness concerning the public "indifference and inhumanity toward armies of railroad men" during the early days of railroading, when thousands of railroad employees were being maimed or killed without the lifting of a finger to prevent the slaughter. Here he impales himself on his own sword. This indifference to the hardships of the railroad men in the early period was bred of individualism. It is the development of a social consciousness and a social conscience which has gradually lightened the burdens not only of the railroad employees but of workers in every field. All of our interferences, all of our laws, are designed to protect the great mass of the people, who if left to shift for themselves, would for the most part be unprotected. It is the reach and sweep of this very protecting arm that Mr. Fagan now rages against. It needs no demonstration nowadays to convince intelligent people that these "patriotic" railroad owners and managers rarely did anything to safeguard the lives or improve the conditions of their workers until the organized strength of the men or the force of law—the outcropping of the social conscience—compelled them to do so.

Sometimes this philosophy takes a more ingratiating form and seeks to persuade men to call a halt on this march toward socialism by telling them that this movement away from individualism is not good for them; that there is danger that conditions be made too easy for them; that they need struggle and adversity and hardship to prevent them from falling into weakness and decay. This is merely our old friend *laissez faire* seeking to restore his ancient prestige by masquerading in these more respectable garments. No reasoning on this subject, it seems to me, is more fallacious nor more harmful than this. Its possibility for harm arises from the fact that the acceptance of the reasoning leads necessarily to a policy of in-

action and quietism. We must be careful not to make conditions and prospects easier for the masses of mankind lest we make them too easy, and we should pharisaically tell them to struggle on because the struggle is good for them. It is perhaps not surprising to find that this doctrine of the efficacy of struggle and hardship does not emanate from those who are enduring most of the hardships of modern economic life.

This argument has appeared in numerous forms, and is on all fours with the theories of the German military writers that war is not only a good thing but a necessary thing if nations and people are to maintain their vigor. Some of these philosophers hesitate to go so far as to advocate war for its own sake, but they say war is desirable at times because it acts as a sort of safety valve to let off some of the belligerency which would otherwise find its outlet through internal strife, such as strikes, lockouts, and the preying of one class in society upon others. The argument runs as follows: People are naturally quarrelsome; if they do not contend with outside parties they will fight among themselves; it is better to have them prey on outsiders than to quarrel among themselves; therefore, war, otherwise reprehensible, is to be condoned because it distracts the attention of the people from their own grievances, and permits them to vent their rage against more distant neighbors. Undoubtedly war does act as a counter-irritant, but suppose the original irritation arises from a condition which ought to be remedied; the use of the counter-irritant then, so far as it is effective, merely blinds the victim as to his real condition and is therefore much more dangerous in the end. It would scarcely be regarded as good dental practice to prescribe a plaster of red pepper for a patient with an aching tooth and then pay no attention to the condition of the tooth.

Apologists for war on this ground are advocating a remedy, or rather a palliative, more dangerous than the disease. The evils of class struggles and contentions within a country, bad as they may seem, are by no means to be compared with the greater evils and sufferings arising from war. This sort of heroic treatment for internal restlessness and disquiet could be compared with the action of a Spartan mother who, desiring to prevent her child from running away and possibly getting



into danger, might break his leg, thus effectively forcing him to remain in her sight. Such reasoning takes account of only two possibilities—struggle within and warfare without. These persons do not stop to think that both external wars and internal dissensions occur because mankind has become habituated to strife through the constant fostering of martial spirit and activities, and that if wars were to cease, this belligerent attitude would gradually be abandoned and conflicts would likewise in large measure disappear.

Indeed, it appears to me that the whole theory that mankind needs adversity and difficulty for its development and that ease and comfort and wealth necessarily breed decay, must be recast. Rome decayed not because of wealth but because of the innate viciousness of the Romans which the lack of the means for gratification merely held in check for a time. Decay comes as a result of the tastes and character of the people, not as the result of wealth. Witness the different conduct of two individuals each having the same amount of wealth. One will spend his money and time in riotous living, the other will be an industrious and honored man in the community. If people are intelligent, noble, helpful and unselfish there need be no fear of decay, and in fact the possession of wealth and leisure will simply present new opportunities for good work and noble development. It is a hopeful sign that this sort of character which can make wise use of wealth and leisure, is manifesting its presence more and more frequently in business and social service in our own country. Useless and extravagant expenditures, idleness and pride of wealth are becoming *passé*. People of wealth and leisure are hearing the call to render useful service.

Those who fear that we may make life too easy for men may object that even if leisure be used wisely by superior characters there will be a majority who will be incapable of so using it. The obvious reply is that if we are not going to keep them permanently in this condition we must let them learn to use leisure by experience. People cannot learn to use wealth and leisure unless they have it. The most glaring examples of the tendency of wealth to produce decay are drawn from the class of the *nouveau riche*; after they have possessed their leis-

ure and opportunities for some time we find little tendency toward the easy and luxurious life that breeds decay.

The philosophy amounts to this: We need hardship to develop "hard" men. This would have some logical basis if we need "hard" men. But do we need such men? Our changing environment and conditions, which mark the progress toward socialism, more and more render unnecessary the qualities of harshness and self-consideration which were suited to a régime of individualism. These "hard" qualities undoubtedly are needed when economic conditions are unfavorable, and when one of the requisites for a comfortable existence is sufficient strength and callousness to deprive others of part of their limited store. But though necessary in the rough and rude stages of economic existence, these "hard" qualities are not attractive; the cave man is admirable only in fiction. Therefore, with the growing emphasis on social well-being as contrasted with individual prosperity there is little need to develop in individuals the qualities which would be fostered by struggle, privation, and suffering.

Implicit in this reasoning is the assumption that human welfare can be worked out through the actions of individuals; that whatever promotes individual progress furthers social welfare *pari passu*; that society is merely the aggregate of individuals, and social advance merely the sum of individual advances. These ideas fall short of the truth. The social body is the sum of the individuals in the group, but it is that *plus*, just as the human body is the aggregate of its individual parts and members but is also something in addition to these; or to adopt another figure, human society is not only a mechanical mixture—it is a chemical combination. Hence it frequently happens that the welfare of the individual and the progress of the society of which he is a member may be temporarily antagonistic. In a similar manner the well-being of the human body is frequently promoted by cutting off and destroying one of the individual members of that body. In economic life it was very early realized that the wants of the individual could not be satisfactorily supplied merely by individual effort. The division of labor, specialization, integration, co-operation, and socialization of industry were necessary before

any considerable progress could be made. Hence we find individuals uniting into families, tribes or other economic groups for the purpose of satisfying their wants more fully and more easily.

Underlying this whole philosophy which seeks to perpetuate struggle and hardship in the supposed interest of individual well-being is the ill-founded assumption that with growing wealth people will cease to exert themselves. To any one familiar with the economic situation of the great mass of men the danger that we are likely to reach such a stage of plethora at any time in the near future seems very unreal. But the assumption is more fundamentally unsound. Even if we could increase our wealth much more rapidly than any experience or imagination could lead us to expect, we would still be as far from satisfying our wants as we are today. Economists have long commented on the unlimited expansibility of human wants. Even the tyro in economic thinking realizes that as soon as one desire is satisfied the way is opened for the consciousness of many other wants. Hence the opposition to the growth of socialism on the ground that it may sap the vigor of mankind by making life too easy is not worthy of serious consideration.

The pilgrimage of mankind is unquestionably headed away from individualism and toward some form of socialistic ideal. What is the shrine; how far have we gone toward it; with what speed are we moving? These are some of the questions we seek to answer by looking forward to the head of the column.

This paper has spoken of socialism as the shrine toward which the cavalcade is moving, but this word is not satisfactory because it is too specific. To each individual socialism connotes some fairly definite scheme of social organization, whereas the term as used here is intended to suggest no definite or predictable program of social reform. It is idealistic rather than real. Perhaps the column is following a mirage. Perhaps there is no possible form of social organization which will be satisfactory. But, at any rate, it is a much more attractive ideal than that of individualism. As we move toward this ideal, even though we may never reach it, we are constantly making the changes in the organization of industry and in life

which we have noted and are developing a consciousness of our responsibility to our fellow-man and of his responsibility to us and all society, which makes life much richer and nobler than the crass individualism of several generations ago.

What progress are we making toward the new ideal? How far and how rapidly are we moving away from individualism? A. M. Simons, in *The New Republic*, recently said: "The very guardians of vested rights and wrongs are setting them lightly aside. More institutions have been discarded in the past three years than in any previous generation." These changes are occurring so rapidly and many of them so quietly that we are not conscious of them until we raise our eyes from the immediate surroundings and examine the changing aspect of things as we have sought to do in this paper. "Only our generation has looked for great social changes without violence. It was a dogma of the old theology, both social and individual, that without shedding of blood there was no remission of sins. Only when the blood-bought machinery of democracy made progress possible through persuasion of majorities was this dogma discarded."

From almost within the shadow of the Stock Exchange, the very name of which in the popular mind is symbolic of the vested rights and privileges by which individualism is buttressed, comes evidence of the realization of the new order in the following words from the editorial pen of a financial paper: "Normally, any man resents inquiry into the way he spends his money and uses the purchased goods, on the ground that the wealth is his own and the manner of its use none of the world's business. But any action that touches the world as deeply as does the use of wealth is the world's business. The citizens of the warring nations have had this made very clear to them. The command of a bank account involves an economic responsibility. The expenditure of every dollar, the efficiency and economy with which every pound and yard is used, these are the small affairs of every day which affect ultimately the whole world, minutely it is true, but the result, constructive, neutral, or destructive, is there, and none but a small mind will disclaim responsibility for his acts because of their littleness."

Corroboration of the thesis of this paper has come recently

from another source generally regarded as conservative. The Supreme Court in upholding the constitutionality of the Adamson law gives evidence throughout its decision not only that the rights of individuals must give way when they conflict with the interests of society, but also that the field within which private rights may be said to exist is constantly becoming smaller. In announcing the opinion of the Court, Chief Justice White said that it has been well established that the railroads are public service enterprises engaged in interstate commerce, and are therefore subject to control by Congress; that the employees also when taking service in an industry of this nature are subject to limitations upon their freedom of action which might not be present in a business which does not affect so seriously the welfare of the public. The court further said: "The capacity to exercise the private right free from legislative interference affords no ground for saying that legislative power does not exist to protect the public interest from the injury resulting from a failure to exercise the private right. . . . And this emphasizes that there is no question here of purely private right."

Legislation and judicial decision play an important part in contracting the field for individualism. Society coerces the individual by laws so that he acts in a manner to promote the public welfare. Political economy, sociology, and political science furnish the criteria upon which these laws are based. In the new social philosophy we do not justify this trenching on private rights; we have gone far past that. The fact that we can find reasons to sanction this invasion of the field for individualism is not so significant as that we do not feel it necessary to seek for such reasons. We almost unconsciously have come to feel that there is no such thing as purely private right in economic affairs.

## Horace Greeley and the South, 1865-1872

EARLE D. ROSS

Professor of History in Simpson College

John Russell Young, residing in Europe during the political campaign of 1872, upon reading the announcement that General Roger A. Pryor was to speak for Greeley in Virginia thus voiced his astonishment:

"The idea of R. A. P.—the representative fire-eater, the Robespierre, or Danton, or if you like it better, the Henry Hotspur of the Southern Revolution, the one orator who clamored so impatiently for the Shrewsbury clock to strike—oh my friend! The spectacle of this leader championing Horace Greeley. Can the irony of events have a deeper significance?"

At first thought, Young's statement of the anomaly and incongruity of the attitude of leading ex-Confederates toward Greeley in 1872 seems not overdrawn. That the Southern press and leaders should with any degree of resignation, not to say cheerfulness, support the candidacy of the editor who had been in the front rank of the opponents of the extension of slavery and of the supporters of a vigorous war policy might seem like carrying too far the adage that "politics makes strange bed-fellows." The most pressing plea of expediency might be expected to fail before such a test. But the consideration of Greeley's relations as editor and publicist with the Southern States after the war will show that there were influences which made his candidacy probably as acceptable to that section as would have been that of any pronounced Republican. It is easy, after the fact, for reminiscencers to conclude that some other coalition candidate could have led the opposition to success in 1872,<sup>2</sup> but, in view of existing conditions, it seems that Greeley's availability, in the South at any rate, has been greatly underrated. It is the purpose of this paper to consider this question.

In order to appreciate truly Greeley's attitude toward the

<sup>1</sup> Mrs. R. A. Pryor, *My Day*, 351f.

<sup>2</sup> See, for instance, Hoar, *Autobiography*, I, 284; White, *Life of Lyman Trumbull*, 402.

reconstructing states it is necessary to have in mind his policy during the war. A relentless opponent of slavery as the enemy of free labor, he stood for restricting its extension rather than for attacking it upon its own ground.<sup>3</sup> Thus in the Chicago convention he had supported a slave-holder whose election he hoped would rally the Whig element of the South to prevent secession.<sup>4</sup> As to secession itself, Greeley upheld the right of a section to withdraw from the Union, in case a majority of its citizens were in favor of such a step; but he objected to the domination of a minority slaveocracy who, he felt, did not represent the true sentiment of their section.<sup>5</sup> During the war, while urging a vigorous prosecution in order to secure the speediest termination, he sought every opportunity to promote peace negotiations, even at the risk of concessions to the Confederacy.<sup>6</sup>

Following the war, Greeley's theory of reconstruction was simple and broad. It was summed up in the phrase in which he characterized his position toward the South in the summer of 1865 and which he reiterated constantly in editorials, private correspondence, and addresses during the next seven years—"Universal Amnesty and Impartial Suffrage."<sup>7</sup> From the start, the editor of the *Tribune* pleaded for the pardon of all those concerned in the rebellion. The day following Lee's surrender he urged that in the hour of victory all intolerant passions be suppressed: "Let us take care that no vindictive impulse shall be suffered to imperil this glorious consummation."<sup>8</sup> The execution of any of the Confederate leaders, he argued, would only needlessly embitter the South; history showed the

<sup>3</sup> See Commons, "Horace Greeley and the Working-Class Origins of the Republican Party," *Political Science Quarterly*, XXIV, 468ff. In the campaign of 1872 Greeley thus stated his position: "I was in the days of slavery, an enemy of slavery, because I thought slavery inconsistent with the rights, dignity, and highest well-being of free labor." Speech at Jeffersonville, Indiana, printed in the Memorial to Horace Greeley published by the Division of Archives and History of the University of the State of New York, 213. Greeley "was in the main a sagacious, temperate, long-headed and patriotic opponent of the extension of slavery. He was not an abolitionist until the slave power drew the sword against the Union." *New York Times*, Feb. 3, 1911, quoted in Memorial to Greeley, 183.

<sup>4</sup> Greeley, *Recollections of a Busy Life*, 389.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 398. Even after the war, Greeley held that if the question of secession had been submitted to a popular vote of the Southern people their decision would have been against that step and the Union would have been preserved without bloodshed. Editorial in *N. Y. Tribune*, Aug. 23, 1865, quoted in Memorial to Greeley, 207.

<sup>6</sup> Linn, Horace Greeley, 193-196, 203-210; Greeley, *Recollections*, 407.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Ingersoll, *Life of Horace Greeley*, 507. For characteristic editorials on this subject see the *Tribune* for June 20, Aug. 26, 1865; May 30, Nov. 27, 1866; Jan. 14, 1867.

<sup>8</sup> *N. Y. Tribune*, April 11, 1865.

folly of such a vindictive policy.<sup>9</sup> Greeley was justly indignant at the continuation of martial law after the cessation of hostilities and was prompt to demand the restoration of a regular legal procedure throughout the country.<sup>10</sup>

While not himself putting forward any specific plan of reconstruction, Greeley advocated a method of formulating such a plan that should have resulted in the most liberal and beneficent policy, the one in the best interest of both sections. In the summer of 1865 the editor of the *Tribune*, with other leading Republicans, conferred with President Johnson on his Southern policy, and Greeley advised that a committee of representative men from both sections be selected to work out a plan of reconstruction. He suggested for the Northern members such broad-minded men as Governor Andrew, Gerrit Smith and Judge Spaulding, and as desirable representatives of Southern interest General Lee and Alexander Stephens.<sup>11</sup> Greeley was hopeful at this time, as he confided to a friend, that some understanding might be reached before the meeting of Congress which would permit the prompt readmission of the seceded states.<sup>12</sup>

These magnanimous sentiments toward the South, it must be remembered, were not the perfunctory expressions of an opposition or independent journal. Greeley was going directly against the sentiment of the radical leaders and probably of a large majority of the voters of the party that his paper was supposed to represent, and he followed this course at no little personal sacrifice. The next year, when the Johnson faction was taking up the amnesty issue, the *Tribune* had this to say of its policy in '65:

"We believe in magnanimity, unity, and the utmost generosity to defeated conspirators and rebels. We showed this when it cost some things to do so—when each avowal of our convictions as to what was the

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, April 11, June 7. See also Greeley's letter of July 23, 1865, to a friend in Europe, expressing confidence that no Confederate leader would be treated with severity except Davis, and hoping that such action might be averted even in his case. Quoted in *ibid.*, Sept. 13, 1867.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, July 11, 1865.

<sup>11</sup> Signed editorial in *ibid.*, Sept. 11, 1866, reprinted in Ingersoll's *Life of Greeley*, 424f. Greeley to J. D. Imboden, June 20, 1872, printed in *Richmond Whig and Advertiser* (Semi-Weekly Edition), Sept. 3, 1872; Imboden to Johnson, June 24, 1872, Johnson MSS. in Library of Congress.

<sup>12</sup> Letter of July 23, 1865, quoted in *N. Y. Tribune*, Sept. 13, 1867.



true national policy cost us at least a thousand subscribers. Others may now outstrip us on this tack—it can be done with perfect impunity but when there was imminent danger that the National ax would fall on the neck of the prostrate and helpless South—when the daily utterances of President Johnson were not rapturously hailed in *The Daily News* and *Richmond Inquirer*—we proved our devotion to a merciful policy at some personal sacrifice."<sup>13</sup>

And again, in 1866, Greeley's frank, unequivocal declaration for universal amnesty destroyed his chances, otherwise good, of an election to the United States Senate.<sup>14</sup>

In urging the second half of his general reconstruction program—impartial suffrage—Greeley was equally persistent; but in seeking such a guarantee he was far more liberal and moderate than the radical congressional leaders. He was perfectly willing that any reasonable suffrage tests be imposed, provided they applied impartially to both races.<sup>15</sup> He demanded the protection of the civil rights of the freedmen;<sup>16</sup> but in this he desired only what was just and reasonable. Thus, in 1871, he deprecated the agitation for separate schools in the country districts in Virginia, but on the ground, it is important to note, that the poor white and negro children would receive no adequate education. In more populous districts he had no objection to such a system.<sup>17</sup> Greeley's opposition to the National Union movement of 1866 was due mainly to the fact that "no guarantee or assurance was given that the black people of the South would be fairly treated."<sup>18</sup>

But despite all opposition to the latter part of his program in the South, Greeley continued his earnest advocacy of amnesty and reconciliation. The rejection of the Fourteenth Amendment by the Southern States the *Tribune* reported in a conciliatory tone, urging that Congress in taking up the work of reorganization now confronting it proceed "wisely, justly,

<sup>13</sup> *N. Y. Tribune*, Feb. 22, 1866.

<sup>14</sup> Editorial in *ibid.*, Nov. 27, 1871; Greeley's letter to the Union League Club, May 23, 1867, Ingersoll, *Life of Greeley*, 43ff.; Linn, *Horace Greeley*, 218; Stebbins, *Political History of the State of New York, 1865-1869*, 1471.

<sup>15</sup> *N. Y. Tribune*, June 20, 1865; Jan. 17, 1866.

<sup>16</sup> See his criticisms of some of the "black codes" in *ibid.*, Dec. 26, 29, 1865, Nov. 27, 1866, and his endorsement of Trumbull's Civil Rights Act, *ibid.*, Feb. 3, 1866.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, Dec. 9, 1871.

<sup>18</sup> Speech at Erie, Pa., Sept. 25, 1872, quoted in Ingersoll's *Life of Greeley*, 663. Cf. editorial to the same effect in *N. Y. Tribune*, Sept. 3, 1866.

beneficently."<sup>19</sup> The Southern constitutional conventions were earnestly, though vainly, urged to avoid everything that might seem to savor of revenge or proscription.<sup>20</sup>

After Grant's election, Greeley made the General's phrase, "let us have peace," the text for repeated appeals for a complete amnesty.<sup>21</sup>

Greeley was desirous for the establishment of a Republican organization in the Southern States entirely free from Northern interference. Only in that way, he was convinced, could the party be a permanent influence there. The Texas radicals who, in 1869, were opposing an early election simply because they were afraid that they could not carry it, were thus admonished:

"It is high time that the Southern Republicans should desist from hanging around the neck of the North and begin to take care of themselves. We shall aid them to ratify the XIVth Amendment whereby full political rights are guaranteed to every native or naturalized citizen regardless of race or color. We shall take care that this amendment be obeyed in spirit and letter. Then we shall say to our Southern brethren, 'Root, hog, or die.'"<sup>22</sup>

The appointment to office of former Confederate leaders was strongly favored by Greeley, both as a means of reconciling their states to the Union and of strengthening the Republican party in the South. He denounced the opposition to the confirmation of an Alabama Colonel as governor of New Mexico, declaring that

"If our friends at Washington think the Republican party too strong in Alabama and are anxious to drive back all reinforcements from the ranks of the former Rebels into the reactionary party, then a proscription of men like Col. Crew is sagacious. Otherwise it seems very much the reverse."<sup>23</sup>

Early in 1870, the *Tribune* suggested that it might be wise for the President to withdraw Hoar's nomination for the Supreme

<sup>19</sup> N. Y. *Tribune*, Jan. 14, 1867. In his editorial, "The True Bases of Reconstruction" (Nov. 27, 1866), Greeley had written: "I am for Universal Amnesty—so far as immunity from fear of punishment or confiscation is concerned—even though Impartial Suffrage should for the present be resisted and defeated."

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, Nov. 20, 1867.

<sup>21</sup> The phrase is used to head a *Tribune* editorial as early as Jan. 4, 1869; see also editorials of June 9, 1869, April 11, Nov. 10, 1871. General Butler, as the leader of the proscribing radicals, was urged in an open letter in the *Tribune*, Nov. 27, 1869, to adopt a more liberal course merely on grounds of party expediency.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, May 24, 1869.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, Apr. 16, 1869.

Court, which was being held up in the Senate, and appoint instead a Southerner.<sup>24</sup> In the appointment of Akerman of Georgia as attorney-general there was seen a cheering sign that men who had participated in the rebellion but had since frankly accepted the results of the war were not to be excluded from public life.<sup>25</sup> "We believe," said the *Tribune* in this connection, "there is no better way to compose the remaining troubles at the South than by showing a generous disposition to meet them half way in forgetting the past, whenever we are sure about our security for the future."<sup>26</sup>

The conservative coalition movements in the border states in 1869-70, which prepared the way for the national Liberal movement of 1872, had Greeley's sympathy so far as they seemed to him to be sincere attempts to secure a release from political disabilities. In the spring of 1869 General Imboden and General Mahone of Virginia sought Greeley's aid in securing the separate submission to the voters of the "iron-clad" provision of the Underwood constitution. This proposal met with Greeley's warmest approval and he used his influence with the President and members of the cabinet, contributing materially, the Virginians believed, to the administration's favorable action.<sup>27</sup> The *Tribune*, meanwhile, urged the speedy removal of all disabilities in Virginia.<sup>28</sup> It was careful in the ensuing campaign not to commit itself to the ticket of either faction, but its general tone was highly favorable to the Conservatives.<sup>29</sup> In Tennessee the position of the Conservative candidate was fully approved and his overwhelming triumph was pointed to as an evidence that the drift toward universal amnesty could not be resisted.<sup>30</sup> In Missouri, the next year, however, Greeley bitterly opposed the Liberal bolt, by reason of its free trade connections, and because, as he held, it was not necessary for the removal of disabilities in that state.<sup>31</sup> But while he considered that opposition to political proscription was in this case only a

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, Jan. 5, 1870.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, June 17, 1870. The *Tribune* took senators to task for higgling over Akerman's rebel record. *Ibid.*, June 18.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, June 17, 1870.

<sup>27</sup> Imboden's letter in *Richmond Whig and Advertiser* (Semi-Weekly Edition), Sept. 3, 1872.

<sup>28</sup> *N. Y. Tribune*, May 5, 17, July 16, 1869.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, May 8, 22, 1869.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, Aug. 7, 1869.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, Sept. 6, 7, Dec. 13, 1870.

pretext, he saw in the success of the Missouri Liberals a further warning to the radical leaders against the continuation of their illiberal policy.<sup>32</sup>

With the meeting of Congress in December, 1871, the *Tribune* predicted that the unwise proscriptive policy, which had already lost the Republicans the control of half a dozen Southern states and a dozen or more members of Congress, would be modified early in the session. But it urged that all disabilities be removed or none, as a partial amnesty would only intensify the agitation for a complete restoration of political rights. "Let the year 1872 be ushered in with rejoicings that the hateful past is forgotten."<sup>33</sup>

But the generous-hearted, liberal-minded editor of the *Tribune* did not confine his friendly relations with the South to pleas for the pardon and political enfranchisement of its citizens. Protesting always his friendship for the masses of the Southern people,<sup>34</sup> he took every opportunity to aid them collectively and individually. Thus, in December, 1865, when Mrs. Clement C. Clay came to New York to seek aid in securing the release of her husband from Fortress Monroe she found Greeley a most sympathetic and helpful friend, and prominent Southerners were surprised to see her in a hotel lobby "hobnobbing with that old Abolitionist."<sup>35</sup> To the Southerners who came to New York to procure means for reestablishing their ruined enterprises the *Tribune's* chief proved a ready and efficient backer. He was especially solicitous for brother journalists from the South, giving them a cordial reference in an editorial paragraph and freely tendering his credit for the purchase of type and paper. Characteristically he regretted that Rhett of the *Charleston Mercury* had not been introduced to him, as nothing, he said, would have given him more pleasure than to do a good turn for his abusive old enemy.<sup>36</sup> The movement for the relief of the Ku Klux prisoners in the Albany Penitentiary was started by Greeley, who induced Gerrit Smith to appeal to the President in their behalf.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, Dec. 21, 1870.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, Nov. 10, 1871.

<sup>34</sup> See for instance an editorial in *ibid.*, Aug. 14, 1866, replying to a criticism in the *N. Y. Times* of Greeley's attitude toward the South.

<sup>35</sup> Clay, *A Belle of the Fifties*, 330.

<sup>36</sup> Sanborn, *Reminiscences of Richard Lathers*, 303.

<sup>37</sup> Frothingham, *Gerrit Smith*, 309.

But by far the most conspicuous of these acts by reason of the general favor it received from the South and the bitter hostility from Northern radicals was the signing of Jefferson Davis' bail bond in 1867.<sup>38</sup> Greeley had become interested in this case as early as 1865. Appealed to in that year by Mrs. Davis, he had secured counsel for the ex-Confederate Chief Executive.<sup>39</sup> From this time on the *Tribune* demanded that Davis should either be brought to trial at once or released.<sup>40</sup> In the summer of 1866, he drew up a memorial to the President to the same effect and secured the support of Gerrit Smith.<sup>41</sup> The next year when prominent Union men were desired as bondsmen Greeley cheerfully volunteered his service.<sup>42</sup> Greeley's relations with Davis at Richmond, of which much was made by the press, consisted merely in an interchange of friendly greetings and a brief call on Mrs. Davis.<sup>43</sup> In the evening he addressed a large audience in the African church, making a strong plea to the whites for reconciliation and giving the blacks some sensible advice.<sup>44</sup>

This simple and characteristic act created no little excitement, both North and South. The Northern radicals were greatly shocked and incensed. Senator Wade had warned Greeley that such an act would "Kick up such a dust as even your eyes have never been stuffed with before."<sup>45</sup> And so it proved. The more hot-headed radicals in the Union League Club were for expelling such an over-liberal member, but were shamed out of their purpose by his manly and defiant letter.<sup>46</sup> The sale of his *American Conflict* almost ceased for a time, thousands of subscribers refusing to take their copies.<sup>47</sup> For this sad lapse from grace Petroleum V. Nasby represented Lucifer as considering the enrollment of the editor of the *Tribune* upon his books.<sup>48</sup> The hostility now aroused in radical circles was a

<sup>38</sup> The emphasis given to this episode in the recent Greeley memorial addresses seems most significant. See especially those of Stewart L. Woodford, Horatio C. King, William McAdoo, and Albert E. Pillsbury in Memorial to Greeley, 33, 51, 55, 73.

<sup>39</sup> Mrs. Davis' Life of Jefferson Davis, II, 781f.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 784; N. Y. *Tribune*, April 19, June 4, 12, 1866; May 13, 1867.

<sup>41</sup> Frothingham, Gerrit Smith, 306-308.

<sup>42</sup> Greeley, Recollections, 414f.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 415f.; N. Y. *Tribune*, May 14, 1867.

<sup>44</sup> N. Y. *Tribune*, May 15, 1867; Ingersoll, Life of Greeley, 637ff.

<sup>45</sup> Ingersoll, Life of Greeley, 429.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 431ff.; N. Y. *Tribune*, May 23, 1867.

<sup>47</sup> Greeley, Recollections, 424.

<sup>48</sup> Locke, Ekkoes from Kentucky, 177-182.

leading cause of Greeley's humiliating defeat for the gubernatorial nomination in 1868.<sup>49</sup>

From the South, on the contrary, came nothing but expressions of praise and gratitude. The press, especially in Virginia, referred with deepest appreciation to the service of Greeley and his Northern companions and predicted from it a great gain for reconciliation.<sup>50</sup> Alexander Stephens in his *War Between the States*, published in 1870, called attention to the "unexampled generosity and magnanimity" of Greeley and his fellow signers.<sup>51</sup>

Greeley seemed highly gratified at the Southern response and not at all disturbed by radical criticism. Replying editorially to his critics, he said that he had hoped this act of good will would exert a pacifying and reconciling influence at the South, but it had done far more good than he had anticipated. From all parts of the South he was receiving assurances that his action was "generally hailed as an overture to reconciliation—an earnest of northern good will and kindness."

"My action in the premises," he concluded, "has done more good than I expected and at less personal cost. I may never again have an opportunity to do so beneficent an act, but should I have, I shall be encouraged by this experience to improve the opportunity."<sup>52</sup> In a speech at Galveston, four years later, he thus further explained his motives:

"I did this out of no particular regard for Jeff. Davis, nor any political friendship, for we were always opposed to each other. The act was to effect my part to reach the heart of the Southern people who felt that their cause was involved with Jeff. Davis. Therefore I did that for the Southern people, not for Jeff. Davis, though they were equally guilty with him."<sup>53</sup>

Following his experience in Virginia, in 1867, Greeley strongly urged that congressmen, who could speak of the administration's policy with more authority, should make speeches in the South as a means to a better mutual understanding.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>49</sup> Alexander, *Political History of New York*, III, 196. The review of Greeley's *Recollections* in the *Nation* characterized the bond episode as "a piece of insensate folly" which had injured Greeley's prestige more than the Niagara peace affair. *Nation*, Nov. 5, 1868, p. 371.

<sup>50</sup> See quotations in *N. Y. Tribune*, May 20, 29, 1867.

<sup>51</sup> Vol. II, p. 663.

<sup>52</sup> *N. Y. Tribune*, May 29, 1867.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, May 30, 1871.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, May 28, 1867.

The economic reorganization of the South after the war was a matter in which Greeley had a deep and lasting interest. Realizing the pressing need for loans to enable planters to restock their estates, he became, in 1867, one of the proposed incorporators of the "Planters Loan and Relief Association of the City of New York."<sup>55</sup> Southern agriculture seemed to him a most promising field for the investment of Northern capital, and he never tired of setting forth the great opportunities in emigration to this new land of promise.<sup>56</sup> The plea of an official of the Georgia Industrial Exposition, in 1871, for closer industrial relations between the North and the South met a cordial endorsement from the *Tribune* which also urged Northern manufacturers to be well represented at the exposition.<sup>57</sup>

This well known interest in the Southern material welfare led to Greeley's trip through the lower South in May, 1871, to speak at the state fair at Houston, Texas. He had been urgently pressed to make the trip by Southern admirers and New York capitalists interested in Southern undertakings.<sup>58</sup> Everywhere on his journey, through what might have been thought a hostile land, the distinguished visitor was well, and usually enthusiastically, received.<sup>59</sup> The *Herald* said that its last batch of Southern exchanges contained "nothing but gossip about Greeley, Greeley, Greeley. Even the crevasse is swallowed up in Greeley."<sup>60</sup> The ultra-Democratic papers, even, with few exceptions, extended a cordial welcome.<sup>61</sup> The *Charleston Courier* said that while Greeley had been one of the most vigorous opponents of the South, he had been among the first to demand universal amnesty. It rejoiced that he would now have an opportunity to see at first hand how badly such a policy had been followed.<sup>62</sup> The *Memphis Appeal* thought that city, as the residence of Davis, should be especially courteous to the man who had made such a sacrifice in their ex-President's

<sup>55</sup> The act for the charter of this corporation was killed in the state Senate. See *ibid.*, April 20, 1867.

<sup>56</sup> See, for instance, *ibid.*, Aug. 1, 1867; May 8, 22, 1869; June 17, 1870.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, Oct. 21, 1867.

<sup>58</sup> See "Mr. Greeley's Letters from Texas and the Lower Mississippi to which are added His Address to the Farmers of Texas and His Speech on his Return to New York," 44.

<sup>59</sup> See accounts of receptions in *N. Y. Tribune*, May 15, 20, 23, June 2, 1871.

<sup>60</sup> *N. Y. Herald*, May 22, 1871.

<sup>61</sup> See statement of Missouri *Democrat* quoted in *N. Y. Tribune*, May 23, 1871.

<sup>62</sup> Quoted in *N. Y. Tribune*, June 2, 1871.

behalf. It felt that the editor of the *Tribune* had often cruelly wronged them, but hoped that "if we show to the world that we can be generous to an enemy who has been unjust, we believe Mr. Greeley will return home and help us plant again the seed whose fruit shall be his with ours to enjoy."<sup>63</sup>

In his speeches on public affairs during the trip the Northern editor pleaded earnestly for a better understanding between the sections and declared strongly for a complete abolition of all proscriptions.<sup>64</sup> Before the Union Club of New Orleans he claimed to be the "first advocate of the abolishment of all disfranchisement." The adoption of such a policy five years before, in his opinion, would largely have prevented the Ku Klux outrages and would ere this have reunited the two sections.<sup>65</sup> In his letters home he expressed the opinion that, in spite of the unfortunate reconstruction policy, the number acquiescing fully in the restoration of the Union was daily increasing.<sup>66</sup>

At a reception given by political friends on his return to New York, Greeley protested that all he had said during his trip "was said in the hope of promoting a clearer and better understanding between the North and the South."<sup>67</sup> In the same speech, he denounced in no uncertain terms the activities of the exploiting carpet-baggers.<sup>68</sup> Greeley's utterances at this time were generally connected by the press with his supposed candidacy for the Republican nomination for president.<sup>69</sup> But whatever the motives back of these declarations, there can be no doubt that this trip coming as a climax to Greeley's good words and deeds for the South did a great deal to make his candidacy, the next year, acceptable in that quarter.

Of the complex influences that led to Greeley's selection as the standard-bearer of the revolting Liberal Republicans and his consequent endorsement by the Democratic national convention, it is not possible or essential to treat in this paper.<sup>70</sup>

It may be observed in passing, however, that with Greeley's

<sup>63</sup> Quoted in *ibid.*, June 5, 1871.

<sup>64</sup> See Galveston speech, *ibid.*, May 30, 1871.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, May 22, 1871.

<sup>66</sup> Letters from Texas, etc., 41.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 50ff.

<sup>69</sup> See *N. Y. Times*, June 8, 1871; *World*, May 30, June 13, 1871; *N. Y. Herald*, June 13, 1871.

<sup>70</sup> See for detailed discussion of these matters the writer's forthcoming monograph on "The Liberal Republican Movement."



life-long opposition to one of the Liberal issues—tariff reduction, his indifference to a second civil-service reform, his supposed availability was a great tribute to his devotion to the other and most conspicuous issue of the movement, that of general amnesty. But it is our chief concern here to note the attitude of the South, in view of his past policies as opponent and advocate, toward Greeley as a presidential candidate.

In the Liberal Republican convention at Cincinnati, though Adams and Trumbull had at first a good following from the South and considerable efforts had apparently been made by Judge Davis' supporters to pack the Southern delegations for their candidate,<sup>71</sup> Greeley received from this section a decisive support, having on the first ballot votes from seven former Confederate States and on the last from all of them but Florida, totaling 116 out of 332.<sup>72</sup>

The Liberal promoters in the South, recruited for the most part from discontented carpet-baggers and scalawags, would represent but a small part of the sentiment of that section; but the prevailing judgment of Southern Democratic leaders was in favor of the endorsement of the Liberal candidate by their party. Prominent Democrats all over the South soon after the Liberal convention declared for coalition,<sup>73</sup> and the greater number of influential Southern newspapers advocated that policy.<sup>74</sup> Certain Southern leaders, who were opposed to Greeley personally, accepted his candidacy as a possible means for the South to free herself from her discredited position.<sup>75</sup> The only marked opposition was in Georgia and even here the Greeley supporters triumphed.<sup>76</sup> The Southern delegations to the Democratic national convention were practically unanimous for the Liberal candidates.<sup>77</sup> In the convention, M. P. O'Con-

<sup>71</sup> See Schurz to Greeley, May 11, 1872, Schurz's Writings (Bancroft ed.) II, 371.

<sup>72</sup> Proceedings of Liberal Republican Convention, 22-29; N. Y. Tribune, May 4, 1872.

<sup>73</sup> See letters in Greenville Enterprise, May 29, 1872; editorial in Springfield Weekly Republican, May 10, 1872; Harrell, Brooks and Baxter War, 119; Hill, B. H. Hill, 350ff.; Ingersoll, Life of Greeley, 547.

<sup>74</sup> See editorials in the Southern Recorder, May 7, 21, 1872; Greenville Enterprise, May 8, 15, 1872; Charleston Courier, quoted in Greenville Enterprise, May 22, 1872; Richmond Whig and Advertiser, May 10, 1872, quoting a dozen Virginia papers, all conditionally for Greeley; lists in N. Y. Tribune, May 10, 11, 18, 1872, and Springfield Weekly Republican, May 10, 1872.

<sup>75</sup> See, for instance, Lamar to Kumelin, May 6, July 15, 1872; Mayes, L. Q. C. Lamar, 170f.

<sup>76</sup> Avery, History of Georgia, 501; Hill, B. H. Hill, 65, 350ff.; Phillips, Life of Robert Toombs, 267.

<sup>77</sup> Official Proceedings of the National Democratic Convention of 1872, 66.

nor, of South Carolina, and Judge Reagan, of Texas, made strong and effective pleas for the acceptance of the Liberal platform, urging that by the support of Greeley and his program the South might be freed from all its disabilities and complete reconciliation secured.<sup>78</sup>

In the campaign most significant efforts were made in all parts of the South to emphasize and magnify Greeley's services for that section. The *Tribune* of the sixties was quoted to show that Greeley favored peaceful secession;<sup>79</sup> his recommendation of General Lee as a reconstruction commissioner in 1865 was made known to the public;<sup>80</sup> the fact that the editor of the *Tribune* had contributed to purchase a horse for a Southern Baptist minister who had lost his property in a Federal raid was thought worthy of mention.<sup>81</sup> Greeley's part in securing relief for the Ku Klux prisoners was not forgotten;<sup>82</sup> the signing of Davis' bond was a standing plea for the Liberal candidate in the South—in Richmond the bond with the signers' names prominently displayed was lithographed for distribution as a campaign document;<sup>83</sup> and in general it was argued that Grant's reelection would mean the continued oppression of the South, while the success of Greeley would secure her restoration to a position of equality in the Union.<sup>84</sup>

In the North, Southern speakers like Richard Lathers<sup>85</sup> and M. P. O'Connor<sup>86</sup> feelingly urged Greeley's election as a means of reconciliation. Greeley in his letter of acceptance<sup>87</sup> and in his campaign speeches<sup>88</sup> kept the amnesty and reconciliation issue constantly to the fore.<sup>89</sup>

The Republicans, on their side, sought to represent Greeley's relations with the South in such a way as to discredit the Liberal candidate. Greeley was now denounced as an

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 48-51; O'Connor, M. P. O'Connor, 56-60.

<sup>79</sup> *Southern Recorder*, May 21, 1872.

<sup>80</sup> *Richmond Whig and Advertiser* (Semi-Weekly Edition), June 21, 1872.

<sup>81</sup> *Greenville Enterprise*, July 31, 1872.

<sup>82</sup> *Richmond Whig and Advertiser* (Semi-Weekly Edition), Aug. 16, 1872.

<sup>83</sup> *World*, May 23, 1872; *Greenville Enterprise*, May 29, 1872; *Richmond Whig and Advertiser* (Semi-Weekly Edition), June 28, 1872.

<sup>84</sup> See, for instance, *Maryland Union*, July 25, 1872; *Richmond Whig and Advertiser* (Semi-Weekly Edition), June 28, 1872.

<sup>85</sup> *Reminiscences of Richard Lathers*, 302.

<sup>86</sup> O'Connor, M. P. O'Connor, 340ff.

<sup>87</sup> *Annual Cyclopaedia*, 1872, p. 778.

<sup>88</sup> Memorial to Greeley, 211-214; *N. Y. Tribune*, Sept. 19-30, 1872; Ingersoll, *Life of Greeley*, 650-663.

<sup>89</sup> The Democratic-Liberal campaign pamphlet—"Mr. Greeley's Record on the Question of Amnesty and Reconstruction from the Hour of Gen. Lee's Surrender," gives extracts from Greeley's editorials and speeches.

original secessionist in theory and his activities during the war and reconstruction were represented as decidedly favorable to the Southern cause.<sup>90</sup> His conciliatory appeals to the South in the campaign were interpreted by his opponents in the same way. He was seriously charged with a purpose to pension Southern soldiers, to pay the Confederate debt, and to appoint to his Cabinet ex-rebels like Raphael Semmes.<sup>91</sup> Radical papers and speakers predicted in the event of Greeley's election the restoration to power of the rebel leaders with probable future attempts at secession and the certain undoing of much of the work of reconstruction.<sup>92</sup>

While there were doubtless many Democrats in the South who could not bring themselves to support the old enemy of their party,<sup>93</sup> it does not seem possible that any other pronounced Republican who had been active in national politics throughout the period of the war and reconstruction<sup>94</sup> could have secured a fuller support from that section. Certainly there was none whose theoretical position on secession was so satisfactory, who had tried so hard to secure an early peace and to whom so many conciliatory and helpful words and acts during reconstruction could be accredited. If the Democratic leaders of the South found it difficult to justify the support of Greeley to the rank and file of the party, they would have found it still more difficult to secure support for a Republican

<sup>90</sup> Foulke, *Life of O. P. Morton*, II, 263; Flower, *Life of M. H. Carpenter*, 271; Senator Conkling's speech, printed in *N. Y. Times*, July 24, 1872; *Cincinnati Semi-Weekly Gazette*, Oct. 8, 1872; *Kansas Commonwealth*, Aug. 18, Sept. 15, 1872.

<sup>91</sup> *Springfield Weekly Republican*, Aug. 16, 1872; *World*, Aug. 12, Sept. 3, 1872 (quoting such charges); *San Francisco Evening Bulletin*, Oct. 14, 1872; *N. Y. Times*, July 22, 24, 25, 31, Aug. 12, 14, 30, 31, 1872.

<sup>92</sup> Flower, *M. H. Carpenter*, 273; Williams, *Life of R. B. Hayes*, I, 373; Mayes, *L. O. C. Lamar*, 172; Adams, *Life of Emory A. Storrs*, 286; *North American Review*, Oct., 1872, pp. 420ff.; *Old and New*, Sept., 1872, p. 373 Oct., 1872, pp. 381ff.; *Milwaukee Weekly Sentinel*, Aug. 27, 1872; *Wisconsin Weekly State Journal*, Aug. 13, 1872; *San Francisco Evening Bulletin*, Oct. 15, 1872; *Missouri Democrat*, June 28, 1872; *Harper's Weekly*, June 8, 29, July 20, Aug. 24, 31, Oct. 12, 19 and *passim* the campaign.

<sup>93</sup> See, for example, Fleming, *Reconstruction in Alabama*, 754f.; Hamilton, "The Election of 1872 in North Carolina," *SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY*, XI, 148, 151.

<sup>94</sup> This would not apply to C. F. Adams as he was out of politics during this period, but, even so, Adams would have had serious weaknesses as a candidate (such as the opposition of the Irish, his unpopularity in the West and his utter lack of personal magnetism) that joined to other unfavorable influences would undoubtedly have caused his defeat. Trumbull, while he had for the most part been identified with the conservative element in Congress, did not have the conspicuous claims to Southern gratitude that Greeley had. And Trumbull was not always sufficiently conciliatory and tactful. In April, 1872, for instance, he had aroused great indignation at the South by referring in a speech in Cooper Institute to the late rebels as "traitors." Horace White to Trumbull, April 25, 1872, Trumbull MSS. in Library of Congress. Of course, no Republican of the Sumner school could have been tolerated by the South.

who had no claims on the South's gratitude. As it was, Greeley's few electoral votes all came from Southern and border states,<sup>95</sup> and the Southern Democrats were placed clearly on record as accepting the results of the war and supporting the editor of the most conspicuous organ of the Union cause.

The South's feeling for Greeley was still further manifested in the notices of his tragic death, shortly after the election. The prevailing note of the most influential Southern journals was that, while Greeley had deeply wronged their section before and during the war, he had largely made up for his errors and injustice by his magnanimous attitude during reconstruction and by becoming their champion in the Liberal campaign.<sup>96</sup>

And it was by no means a mistaken impulse which led the wisest and most devoted Southern leaders to turn to Horace Greeley as a deliverer in 1872. In spite of the apparently overwhelming defeat of the Liberal movement, the policy of the Southern leaders in accepting its principles and candidates had most fortunate results for their section. The coalition movement led by Greeley largely broke the force of the radical charge of continued disloyalty and brought to the South new and influential Northern allies;<sup>97</sup> and, besides, it advanced decidedly the reconstruction and consequent success of the Democratic party through which the "New South" was to exercise such a large influence in national politics.

---

<sup>95</sup> The activities of Federal troops and officials in several of the Southern States seem to have contributed to Grant's success. See, for instance, Hamilton, "The Election of 1872 in North Carolina," *SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY*, XI, 148f. (dealing with the state election which largely influenced the national); Fleming, *Reconstruction in Alabama*, 755; Davis, *Reconstruction in Florida*, 640f.

<sup>96</sup> The special collection of newspapers containing Greeley obituaries in the Cornell University library has a representative selection from the papers of all the Southern States. In an examination of these papers I have found but three unforgiving condemnations of Greeley's public services, and these were in unimportant country papers.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. Hill, B. H. Hill, 65; Julian, *Political Recollections*, 349.

## British Praise of America

H. HOUSTON PECKHAM

On a certain spring day in 1917 the city of London, from one end to the other, was ablaze with American flags. Towers, poles, windows, and balconies from Hackney to Hammersmith proudly displayed the Stars and Stripes. And in St. Paul's, the great cathedral of the British Empire, a huge assemblage which included the King and Queen joyfully sang "The Star Spangled Banner." A few weeks later an American general, accompanied by his staff, landed at an English port. The party were met by the lord mayor of the city and by one of the finest brass bands in the United Kingdom. An enormous crowd, forgetting for the time being its traditional British reserve, shouted itself hoarse with enthusiasm. That same spring a group of English gentlemen, headed by one of the most distinguished British statesmen of recent times, placed a memorial wreath at the tomb of George Washington.

But what of all this? Were not these demonstrations but the natural outpouring of a mother country's pride in a wonderful daughter—pride and gratitude that that daughter had taken up arms by the mother's side in a great common cause? Was it surprising that a nation should show affection for another nation, akin to it in speech, in customs, in traditions, and, to a considerable extent, in race? Thus might a Martian, a Jovian, a Neptunian, or even an Oriental query. Few Americans, however, would so query; for the average American, whether he realizes it or not, has been born, suckled, weaned, reared, and nurtured on Anglophobia. In his grade-school history class he has learned to hate eternally the wicked British redcoat. In his high-school and college German courses he has had it repeatedly dinned into his ears that Germany is emphatically *the* nation of Europe, and that the English are a degenerate, decadent people. Perhaps at some time or other he has met some bumptious, disagreeable Englishman whom he quite disliked. Possibly, if he is of a very convivial nature, he has been bitterly disappointed because he once crossed the path of a stony-hearted Britisher who at first sight failed to thump

him on the back, call him by his Christian name or nickname, and inquire into all his family and business affairs. Doubtless, as a child, he has read between the lines of more than one nursery book that most people born anywhere between Land's End and John O'Groat's have horns, and that all of them have cloven hoofs. And somehow it has seeped into the innermost cells of his brain that no Englishman ever opened his mouth to speak of America, unless it were to speak unkindly.

This last point is, I believe, of supreme importance. A person of intelligence may outgrow his school history, and amid the storm and stress of a great world war he may even forget a portion of his high-school or college *kultur*. But early impressions which come from some unknown, intangible source, and which, like Topsy, "just grow," are exceedingly difficult to escape.

I am reminded of a conversation which I had, some months ago, with a friend of mine. He is a well-read man, albeit a man of rather violent prejudices. One of his pet prejudices is a thorough-going hatred of England and all things English. In the conversation to which I refer, he remarked, as fully a hundred others have remarked in my hearing: "We ought to help the French; but what a pity it is that we have to go in on the same side as the British! I don't see how any good Yankee could have any enthusiastic love for them."

Now I myself must plead guilty, ever since a delightful six weeks spent on John Bull's home island, to a sneaking admiration for the English and many of their institutions. Moreover, my superficial reading of English history, and my somewhat more thorough study of English literature, have made me feel secretly, these many years, that for a little island no larger than the State of Idaho, Britain has done tolerably well in the matter of producing great men and fostering great movements. I therefore did something which I had never had the temerity to do before: asked my friend the why and wherefore of his Anglophobia.

"Why," he replied, in words which sounded for all the world like the school history which I studied when I was about thirteen, "how can any true American ask such a question? Hasn't England always been our natural enemy?"

I had the temerity to hint that she had not, and to back up my hint I mentioned the Spanish-American War, the Manila Bay incident, the Samoan affair of 1899, the "Hands across the Sea" movement, the "blood is thicker than water" slogan, the long existent fact of a four-thousand-mile unfortified Canadian border, and a few other things.

But my friend was obdurately unconvertible. "I hate Englishmen," he persisted. "I never saw one yet who was not a conceited ass and an overbearing snob. They hate us too: whenever they write books or articles about us, they always deride us."

I mention this friend of mine for the reason that observation has convinced me that his name is legion. One will find his spiritual kinsmen scattered liberally throughout the length and breadth of these States, and the farther west one goes, the more of them one will find. Westward the course of Anglophobia takes its way. And stronger than the lessons of school histories or academic *kultur* is the impression that from the very first days of our republic British writers have been habitually unkind to us.

A little investigation of the matter will show how this impression has gained such wide credence. Away back in 1820, Sydney Smith asked sneeringly, in the *Edinburgh Review*: "In the four quarters of the globe, who reads an American book? or goes to an American play? or looks at an American picture or statue? What does the world yet owe to American physicians or surgeons? What new substances have their chemists discovered? or what old ones have they analyzed? What new constellations have been discovered by the telescopes of Americans? What have they done in mathematics? Who drinks out of American glasses? or eats from American plates? or wears American coats or gowns or sleeps in American blankets? Finally, under which of the old tyrannical governments of Europe is every sixth man a slave, whom his fellow-creatures may buy, and sell, and torture?"

In this same connection we have all been reminded, many times, that both in "American Notes" and in "Martin Chuzzlewit" Dickens flayed us unmercifully. And most of us are more or less familiar, indirectly at least, with Mrs. Francis

Trollope's "Domestic Manners of the Americans," a book which, in the words of a writer in Johnson's Cyclopaedia, is "a broad and rather offensive caricature, which met with great favor in England."

In this category, too, we must put Thomas Campbell's brief poem, "To the United States of America," in which the Scottish poet officiously rebukes our nation thus:

United States, your banner wears  
Two emblems—one of fame;  
Alas, the other that it bears  
Reminds us of your shame.

Your standard's constellation types  
White freedom by its stars;  
But what's the meaning of the stripes?  
They mean your negroes' scars.

Does this, however, tell the whole tale? Are we to infer from this that no English author ever spoke of America save to find fault? The briefest, most hasty study of the matter will serve to answer these questions in the negative. Even the querulous Sydney Smith admitted the Americans to be "a brave, industrious, and acute people." And Dickens, in the prefaces to his two American works, protests that he has always been prejudiced in favor of, rather than against, the United States, and that if he has spoken plainly about American faults, he has spoken no less plainly about the foibles of his own country.

As for other nineteenth-century British writers, they have been, on the whole, decidedly warm in their praise of the great Western republic. Thus, Thackeray once remarked very graciously to a Philadelphia gentleman: "You know what virtue-proud people we English are. We think we have got it all to ourselves. Now that which most impresses me here is, that I find homes as pure as ours, firesides like ours, domestic virtues as gentle; the English language, though the accent be a little different, with its homelike melody; and the Common Prayer Book in your families. I am more struck by pleasant resemblances than by anything else."

Another Victorian who spoke kindly of the States was Robert Louis Stevenson. Any one who has ever read his fasci-



nating chronicle, "Across the Plains," will recall the emphasis which Stevenson puts upon the genuine warm-heartedness to be found beneath the rather irritatingly blunt exterior of the Western American. And in this connection it is extremely interesting to note that Rudyard Kipling liked this country well enough to remain here for several years; that Andrew Lang declared the American to be the most popular foreigner in England; and that Matthew Arnold, one of the most chronic of fault-finders at home, managed to say a great many good things about the United States during his visits here in the eighties.

And while we are speaking of Victorians, we must not forget that Tennyson, the most representative of all mid-nineteenth-century poets, wrote a beautiful and noble little poem entitled "England and America in 1782." No Briton could well pay the younger country a finer tribute than the great Victorian laureate pays in these glowing lines:

O thou, that sendest out the man  
To rule by land and sea,  
Strong mother of a Lion-line,  
Be proud of those strong sons of thine  
Who wrench'd their rights from thee!  
  
What wonder, if in noble heat  
Those men thine arms withstood,  
Retought the lesson thou hadst taught,  
And in thy spirit with thee fought—  
Who sprang from English blood!

It will thus be seen that even in the days of our fathers and grandfathers, by no means all of the eminent British men of letters spoke ill of the United States. And a glance will show that the British tendency to speak generously of America has grown with the years—that the later English writers have been even more friendly toward us than were their predecessors. Alfred Noyes, for instance, has poetized our land repeatedly, and always in a laudatory spirit. H. G. Wells, in that marvelous war novel, "Mr. Britling Sees It Through," makes Mr. Direck, the American, one of the most lovable of characters. John Masefield has been warmly appreciative of our hospitality. And James Bryce, in his "American Commonwealth,"

has been, as all thorough students of history and political science know, kindly to a fault.

Then there is A. C. Benson, who, in an *Atlantic Monthly* article a few years ago, declared: "I have a great admiration for the American temperament, its sturdiness, its curiosity, its energy."

I wish, however, that every reading man and woman in this country might turn with open and unbiased mind to Arnold Bennett's delightful book, "Your United States." To be sure, Mr. Bennett does not find the United States a Utopia. He finds our taxi-cab service both dear and bad; our restaurant service intolerably slow; our best limited trains sometimes late and ill-heated. What globe-trotting American has not found precisely the same state of affairs? And what reasonable American will take exception to Mr. Bennett's criticisms after reading the paeans of praise with which the novelist of the Five Towns lauds America? He marvels at our business efficiency, votes our telephone system by far the best in the world, finds our theatre-seats much more comfortable than those in London, and discovers the American home to be the most pleasant of all homes. Warm praise, indeed, from any foreigner! And these, mind you, are the words of an Englishman—an Englishman who declares that he "liked New York irrevocably," found words inadequate to describe the length and splendor of the Chicago boulevards, saw in our national pastime of baseball "a beautiful game superbly played," and summarized all by dubbing us Americans "a great people."

Oh, of course, Englishmen have said many harsh things, some of them unjust, about us. So have Germans, Frenchmen, Irishmen, Italians, Scandinavians, Slavs, Spaniards, Turks, Chinamen, Japanese, Hindoos, and South Americans; as any one, by a little patient research, is bound to perceive. I am not talking about the period between August, 1914, and April, 1917—the period of our neutrality. Whatever caustic things were said in the old country then were due, as Mr. Wells has pointed out in "Mr. Britling," to frayed nerves. Let us be reasonable enough to forget all that.

And laying aside those two years and eight months, we shall find, I think, that during the century and more since the sign-

ing of the Treaty of Ghent, John Bull has been pretty favorably disposed toward us—rather more favorably than we have been toward him. This is of the utmost importance; for a discovery of this fact is likely to lead to a change of viewpoint on the part of many an American—likely to impress us with the fact that John Bull is our friend as well as our ally, and that this being so, we may well adopt a more charitable, more enthusiastic attitude toward him. Why not? Waiving all sentiment, what can we hope to gain by letting shrewd Teuton propagandists continue to do what they have been doing for a long time: divide American opinion by prejudicing as many of us as possible against the most powerful, the most germane, and one of the most genuinely amiable of our allies?

AUTHOR'S NOTE:—In order that he may not be misunderstood, the author of the foregoing article wishes to state that he is an American of Colonial descent, with no close English connections; that he is a Son of the American Revolution on both sides of the house; that he is only half English in blood, and more than one-fourth German; that he is nine generations removed from England, and only six from Germany; and that he was born and reared in the Middle West, that hotbed of ardent, whole-souled Anglophobia.

## Sensuousness in the Poetry of Milton and Keats<sup>1</sup>

WALTER GRAHAM  
Western Reserve University

An excuse for this paper may be found in the fact that Milton and Keats present some interesting likenesses. Both loved beauty. Milton, in a letter (No. 7) to Charles Diodati in 1637, says:

"I seek for a certain image of supreme beauty, through all the forms and faces of things (for many are the shapes of things divine)."

Likewise, in his last days, Keats declared, "I have loved the principle of beauty in all things," and in one of his best-known poems, he identified truth and beauty as "All ye know on earth, and all ye need to know." Again, both poets made remarkable use of sensuous language and suggestion in order to present beauty to their readers. Although Keats is undoubtedly pre-eminent in this respect, a study of Milton's poetry leads one to believe he has not been fully appreciated as a poet of sensuous appeal. The interval of centuries between them, and their respective classic and romantic attitudes toward their art, make a study of the two rather a matter of contrasts than of likenesses—except in the general ways already noted. Without any further reference to their common love of beauty, some more or less significant facts may be pointed out regarding their use of sensuous appeals.

For lack of a more convenient and serviceable definition, the term "sensuous" may be limited to include only those qualities of poetry which address the senses directly or suggest pictures or images of sense. With such a qualification of the word used, we may attempt to discover the nature of the sensuous appeal in the two poets, and the extent to which each employed it. It is well to notice in passing that our definition is much like Coleridge's. He said, "To express in one word all that appertains to the perceptions, considered as passive and

<sup>1</sup>A very little help was received from Geest's dissertation, *Der Sensualismus bei John Keats* (Freiburg, 1908), and Cotterill's *An Introduction to the Study of Poetry* (London, 1882).

merely recipient, I have adopted from our elder classics the word *sensuous*." It differs, however, from Milton's meaning in his famous "simple, sensuous, and passionate." He seems to have meant by "sensuous" what we should term "concrete" or "particular."<sup>2</sup>

In a review of the descriptive passages to be found throughout the poetry of Milton and Keats, the most striking general fact that impresses itself upon one is that of Milton's fidelity to life. This statement needs to be explained, perhaps, for the language of this poet is often obsolete and his colors dim. His images may, to the hasty student, appear inferior to those of the romantic poet, whose hues are more brilliant and stimulating to the imagination. But a careful examination will convince one that Milton's pictures more often give the pleasure of recognition. In spite of the classical mould of the expression, the language, and the imagery, somehow or other he has held the mirror up to human nature and fixed the reflection in inimitable verses. But this is a very general distinction which ought to be illustrated further.

*L'Allegro* contains only nine color words, and some of these are such conventional adjectives as *ebon*, *amber*, *russet*, *saffron*, and *golden*. The beautiful description of Eden in book iv of *Paradise Lost* contains only seven color words, three of which are forms of *gold*. Not much can be said, then, for Milton's use of color in description. In contrast with these figures, Keats, in a passage of equal length from *Isabella*, has twenty-two. Among them are *vermilion-spotted*, *crimson*, *silver*, *rainbow-sided*, *wannish*, *purple*, *damask*, *scarlet*, *sapphire*, *amethyst*, and *rubious-argent*. One reason for this difference was the *penchant* of the romantic author for color in contrast with the classic's reserve,—only one expression, of course, of the tendency to the specific in the one and the accustomed generalization of the other. It is often true that Keats's tints are a little too bright to be convincing. If "orient pearl" and "grey" fail to give us a vivid impression of color sometimes, such a passage as

---

<sup>2</sup> Beeching: *Passion and Imagination in Poetry*, Cambridge, 1901.

"All my clear-eyed fish,  
Golden or rainbow-sided, or purplish,  
Vermilion-tailed, or finned with silvery gauze;"

hits the other extreme. It may do for a description of faery fish, but it doesn't recall anything familiar to the reader. Milton's broadly suggestive line, "While the still morn went out with sandals grey," is much more convincing. Perhaps these passages are commentary enough on the use of color by the two poets. Neither was true to nature in the sense that Wordsworth was on the one hand or Scott on the other. Keats's greater use of specific hues did not secure for him any larger measure of pictorial power for portraying natural objects.

In the poetry of Milton there is no more frequent appeal than that which his musical education and taste fitted him to employ. Divine harmonies and "voices sweet" were always in the ear of the blind poet after the world of sight had been lost to him, and even before affliction came he wrote some of the most musical verse in any language. In this particular form of sensuousness, Milton greatly excelled Keats, who employed it less, perhaps, than any other kind of suggestion. And when Keats did use it, he failed to make his readers hear the sound or feel the sensible effects as Milton succeeded in doing almost invariably.

"Straight with sudden swell and full,  
Sweet music breathed her soul away,"—

(End. III, 768.)

or the beautiful, Spenser-like passage describing the magic effect of the nightingale's song (st. viii) do not wake in us the responses we are conscious of when Milton describes such music

"As may with sweetness, through mine ear  
Dissolve me into ecstasies,  
And bring all heaven before my eyes,"

(Il Penseroso, 162-5.)

or tells us with sensuous accuracy about

"a shower still,  
When the gust hath blown his fill,  
Ending on the rustling leaves,  
With minute-drops from off the eaves."

(*Il Penseroso*, 125-8.)

Keats's sound-pictures have the vagueness and mysterious other-worldliness characteristic of romantic poets. His poetry contains few such vivid passages as

"to hear  
The shepherd's pipe come clear from aery steep,  
Mingled with ceaseless bleatings of his sheep."

For the most part, he gives impressions of sound that are not recognizable to human experience.

Milton believed that the "Sphere-born harmonious sisters, Voice and Verse," were intended to accompany each other. In regard to his own special fitness for uniting them, there are excellent lines of comment in *Ad Patrem*. His training from earliest youth filled his heart with celestial melodies, which found ephemeral expression in his exercises upon the organ and permanent record in his poetry. We may, at this point, note two distinct aspects of Milton's predominant sound-sensuousness.

He exhibited a thorough knowledge of the quality and effect of sound with which he dealt. He well knew the result, when on the organ

"His volant touch  
Instinct through all proportions low and high  
Fled and pursued transverse the resonant fugue,"

(*P. L.* II, 561-3.)

and he calculated surely the effect on the reader when he pictured

"Oft, on a plat of rising ground,  
. . . afar the curfew sound,  
Over some wide-watered shore,  
Swinging slow with sullen roar."

(*Il Penseroso*, 73-76.)

The effect of this last description is to call up the very sound

as we have heard it many times, and to give us the peculiar joy of recognition.

In addition to his faculty for making the reader enjoy emotions recollected in tranquility, no poet in English has been able to put celestial melody—wholly outside the possibility of recognition—into such harmonious language. Examples are

"the sound  
Symphonious of ten thousand harps, that tuned  
Angelic harmonies;"

and

"In their motions, Harmony divine  
So smoothes her charming tones that God's own ear  
Listens delighted."

The use of onomatopœia is so common in poetic practice, we can only remark in passing that Milton had no equals in the employment of it. None surpassed him in the feeling for sound values. Compare

"Harmonious sound on golden hinges moving," and  
"Clashed on their sounding shields the din of war."

In these, and a thousand other passages, we see the value of Milton's training in harmony and musical science. Keats, on the other hand, failed to develop this side of his sensuousness. Milton carried it farther than any poet before or since, and earned the right to be called "Mighty-mouthed inventor of harmonies."<sup>8</sup>

It is in appealing to the senses of taste and smell that Keats appears at his best. It is not too much to say that he is supreme among English poets of all ages in this respect. Taste and odor are often so mingled and so difficult to distinguish that we are almost justified in considering the two as one in the impression made. Odor almost always accompanies taste in the appeals of both Milton and Keats, indicating that their

<sup>8</sup> G. S. Spaeth: *Milton's Knowledge of Music* (Princeton, 1913). Prof. Spaeth has shown that Milton had a tendency to describe in terms of sound, and that—more than any other poet—he used such words as *noise*, *note*, *brass*, *drone*, *melodious*, *murmur*, *roar*, *liquid*, *clamorous*, *jangling*, *resonant*, *symphonious*, *tuneful*, as well as musical terms little used in poetry,—*air*, *cadence*, *antiphony*, *counterpoint*, *descant*, *fugue*, *numbers*, etc.



images and pictures are in that measure true to life. Usually we feel that the impressions we receive from reading Milton are less tangible and realistic than those derived from the other poet, although many passages seem to parallel rather closely the latter's work. The famous stanza xxx of *St. Agnes* is somewhat like the familiar passage in *Paradise Lost*, v. 338ff. One can easily believe that Keats was consciously influenced by Milton here. Eve spread the table with

"fruit of all kinds, in coat  
Rough or smooth, rined, or bearded husk, or shell,  
She gathers, tribute large, and on the board  
Heaps with unsparing hand. For drink, the grape  
She crushes, inoffensive must, and meaths  
From many a berry, and from sweet kernels pressed  
She tempers dulcet creams—nor these to hold  
Wants her fit vessels pure; then strews the ground  
With rose and odors from the shrub unfumed."

With this, compare

"And still she slept an azure-lidded sleep,  
In blanch'd linen, smooth and lavender'd,  
While he from forth the closet brought a heap  
Of candied apple, quince, and plum, and gourd;  
With jellies soother than the creamy curd,  
And lucent syrups, tinct with cinnamon;  
Manna and dates, in argosy transferr'd  
From Fez; and spicy dainties, every one,  
From silken Samarcand to cedar'd Lebanon."

We are struck at once with the greater *particularity* of Keats in his description of the feast, and it is not surprising, therefore, that we find it easier to taste and smell his appetizing collocation.

If we examine other passages representative of the two poets,—notably, Diana's feast *Endymion* (IV, 565ff), *Hyperion: a dream* (I, 28-36), *Paradise Lost* (IX, 575ff), and the tempter's feast in *Paradise Regained* (II, 338-368),—we must come to the conclusion, already suggested, that Milton's descriptions and the corresponding impressions are poetically general in their appeal to the senses of taste and smell. They are consistent with the noble dignity of his themes, but in re-

spect to real sensuous appeal, they are less directly effective than the luscious phrases of Keats.

Keats is probably without a peer when it comes to the art of putting delicate physical sensations into words. Milton wrote nothing that will compare with the following excerpts:

"Until the popped warmth of sleep oppressed  
Her soothed limbs, and soul fatigued away;"

(*Agnes*, xxvii.)

"wherefore may I not  
Be ever in these arms? in this sweet spot  
Pillow my chin forever? ever press  
These toying hands, and kiss their smooth excess?  
Why not forever and forever feel  
That breath about my eyes?"

(*End*, II, 712ff.)

"Pillowed upon my fair love's ripening breast,  
To feel forever its soft fall and swell,  
. . . still to hear her tender-taken breath."

(*Bright Star*, 10ff.)

The lines describing the guilty passion of Adam and Eve—  
(*Paradise Lost*, IX, 1035ff.),

"There they took their fill of love and love's disport  
Took largely, of their mutual guilt the seal,  
The solace of their sin, till dewy sleep  
Oppressed them, wearied of their amorous play.  
. . . . . that fallacious fruit,  
That with exhilarating vapor bland  
About their spirits had played,"—

show Milton's entirely different manner of treating a subject containing large possibilities for physical appeal. He makes no effort to be sensuously vivid or direct. No reader of ordinary temper would get any stimulus from such a picture of sexual indulgence as this. Milton, in picturing a supremely sensual act of Adam and Eve, stimulates the sense of the reader less than does Keats in his merely lyrical moods. This difference of manner in the two poets is significant. It is not entirely a matter of power, but, to some extent, of purpose.

But the sensuousness of a poet ought not to be limited by definition to any distinct forms of address to the senses. Most actual impressions that delight human senses with sudden thrills of emotion or recollected joys are combinations too subtle for analysis. The organs of sense are recipient all, or nearly all, at once. It is so with the impressions we get from reading poetry. Our senses are often appealed to by some train of association, and we are conscious of rare and complex feelings, pleasant or distasteful. Emotions are disturbed which are beyond perfect expression. The highest art is that which calls up the highest degree of response, so that as we read we feel again those familiar, gratifying, or melancholy and solemn sensations.

In making such subtle and complex appeals to readers, Milton is superior to Keats. Not that he uses the minutiae of description so much as the latter in creating physical impressions, but he seems to have a delicate feeling for effects upon the human mind, so that no matter how dignified and conventional his diction or how remote from actual life the scenes he is describing, he almost never fails to awaken a response. He convinces. Some of these delicate and occasional sensations which give us a rare kind of reminiscent pleasure are awakened by a reading of the accompanying passage from *Paradise Lost* (IV, 325ff.):

"They sat them down; and, after no more toil  
Of their sweet gardening labour than suffice  
To recommend cool Zephyr, and make ease  
More easy, wholesome thirst and appetite  
More grateful," . . . . .

The comfortable sense of relaxation after moderate weariness, the degree of hunger which makes food most toothsome and appreciated, and the hint of human companionship, are all here. We respond readily to this pleasant picture. Again, the delicacy and convincingness of the following cannot be lost upon anyone who has ever felt the beauty of these common but perennially appealing aspects of nature. (IV, 641-9)

"Sweet is the breath of Morn, her rising sweet,  
With charm of earliest birds; pleasant the sun,

When first on this delightful land he spreads  
 His orient beams, on herb, tree, fruit, and flower,  
 Glistening with dew; fragrant the fertile Earth  
 After soft showers; and sweet the coming-on  
 Of grateful Evening mild; then silent Night,  
 With this her solemn bird, and this fair Moon,  
 And these the gems of Heaven, her starry train;"

With the above lines, compare *Hyperion*, I, 1-3,

"Deep in the shady sadness of a vale  
 Far sunken from the healthy breath of morn  
 Far from the fiery noon, and eve's one star,"

or *St. Agnes*, xxxvi,

"Beyond a mortal man impassioned far  
 At these voluptuous accents, he arose  
 Ethereal, flush'd, and like a throbbing star  
 Seen mid the sapphire heaven's deep repose;  
 Into her dream he melted, as the rose  
 Blendeth its odor with the violet,—  
 Solution sweet."

Keats succeeds inimitably in creating romantic atmosphere, but we seldom get from his poetry the blend of simple, sweet sensations which none can describe, and only the truly great poet can reawaken. Charm and romantic witchery are within Keats's power and purpose; Milton's inexplicable power and skill induce the response in our hearts, and this is holding the mirror up to nature. Keats is superior to the older poet in intensity of impression and directness of appeal, but he fails to give us the same measure of artistic truth that we get in the more general vignettes of Milton.

The truth is that in all his appeals to sense, Milton never let go a certain restraint. The emotion which prompted his sensuousness was controlled by a mind always dominating and refining. The obvious difference between the poets was to some extent the reserve and saneness of maturity in contrast with the golden wonder and flush of youth. Milton never lapsed into maudlin softness or "slippery blisses." He could never have been guilty of such lines as

"His erewhile timid lips grew bold,  
And poesied with her's in dewy rhyme."

(*Isabella*, ix.)

His sensuousness was of another century and of another kind than that of Keats.

Paul Elmer More has said well that to call Keats Greek is to miss the mark.<sup>4</sup> Here lies one cause for his difference from Milton. A poet of Greece, he was, but only through his kinship with the Elizabethans. He had none of the Greek balance and reserve which the neo-classicists handed down to the later century as their noblest gift to art. A little of Milton's classicism would have saved him from the extremes he went to. At some points he verges on the Greek attitude, to be sure, but on the whole he is governed by the romantic temper, and in nothing more than in his sensuousness. The poise and control are lacking. To this very lack we owe some of the most exquisite and appealing lines in the language, and unfortunately we owe to it also some of the mushiest verses ever written by any poet.

To some extent, then, the difference between Milton and Keats is due to their respective ways of looking at life and art. The terms "classic" and "romantic" are dangerous and unsatisfactory, perhaps, but they are convenient to use here. We call Milton the greatest English classicist. This point of view is expressed in his finely restrained use of the sensuous element in poetry. The lack of reserve in Keats is, on the other hand, one of his most romantic traits, and is shown in the lengths to which his abandonment carries him.

Perhaps another difference in the sensuousness of the two poets is the result of Milton's Puritanism and Keats's paganism. There was a wide gulf between their philosophies. The most noticeable effect is seen in what we may call Milton's "chastity" of image and phase. He treats the conventionally objectionable things with practically the same freedom that the later poet does, but he never allows them to become animal and degrading in the impressions they make upon the senses. Keats, on the contrary, too often stirs us with his sensuous dalliance so that we receive from his lines impressions which

<sup>4</sup> Paul Elmer More: *Shelburne Essays*, fourth series (N. Y., 1917), p. 99.

the youthful poet probably did not intend at all. On the whole, sensuousness in Milton is a very subordinate and incidental element. In Keats it is carried to a great extreme, until often we feel nothing but the bewildering physical thrill. He seems to give us sensuousness for its own sake, while Milton keeps his appeals directed to the spiritual end of his high purpose.

Keats's poetry has been characterized as unspiritual. The obvious lack of a lofty theme in much of it has led Arnold and some other critics to regard it as, in a way, unwholesome and fleshy. Perhaps this criticism is unfair. His devotion to the principle of beauty places Keats among the immortal souls of all time. If he is unwholesome and fleshy in anything, it is in this extreme expression of sensuous feeling. I think it is only just to say of him that while his soul may have been with the skylarks in the clouds, much of his poetry "clung to the ground." Milton—in marked contrast—though often concerned with the human sensations, the emotions and feelings of men, in his poetry seemed always to walk with angels.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> The direct influence of Milton on Keats has been so well covered by De Selincourt in his edition of Keats's poems that I cannot hope to add anything. See Appendix C, edition of 1905 (New York), p. 582, *On Sources of Keats's Vocabulary*. The influence is shown more in allusion and Miltonic cadence than in the borrowing of words or phrases. I have made a careful comparison of the two poets, but find no evidence of tangible borrowing from Milton in the sensuous passages.

## The Father of the Wartons

DAVID H. BISHOP

Professor of English in the University of Mississippi

[This article is a by-product of investigation in the life of Joseph Warton. It is thought that it assembles about all discoverable items in regard to Thos. Warton, Sr. In preparing it, among other sources not mentioned in the sketch of Warton appearing in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, I have been permitted to see family MSS. (the larger part of which were formerly owned by Millard, the author of a history of Basingstoke), now in the possession of Mr. Arthur Lee, of Lower Faringdon, Alton, Hants, a descendant of Thomas Warton. I wish here to express my thanks to Mr. Lee.]

Those students of eighteenth century literature who leave the main highway find few names more significant than that of Warton. Thos. Warton, Jr., was the first important explorer of our earlier and forgotten poetry. Joseph Warton, through his *Essay on Pope*, is credited with the first trumpet blast in the onset against neo-classicism in English literature. The name extends in bibliographies of first editions from 1657 to 1811. The first year marks the date of *Refinement in Sion* by Anthony Warton, "a minister of the Word at Breamore, Hants"; the last is the date of "*The Poetical Works of John Dryden* . . . by J[oseph]. Warton, D. D., . . . J[ohn]. Warton, M. A. and others." John Warton, who was the son of Joseph, had published *Poems, Original and Translated* in 1792. He was of the fifth generation removed from Anthony Warton of Breamore, Hants. The generation of Joseph and Thomas, Jr., is most important, but interest belongs to their father, even more than is indicated by the sketch in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. At any rate, a concession to this suggestion, with the chance of throwing some light on the family descent, accounts for this article on Thos. Warton, the elder.

The eighteenth century Wartons, it appears, knew little of their ancestry. At any rate, they left meager personal records. Wooll and Mant, the respective biographers of Joseph and Thos. Warton, Jr., contrived to furnish the least possible information. They were both ministers; it seems that they felt it be-

fitting to maintain the grave tone of the pulpit, while they found escape from errors and the toil of investigation in the generalities that probably characterized their pulpit utterances. Relying upon tradition furnished by John Warton, Mant connected the family with that of Sir Michael Warton, of Warton-Hall, Lancashire.<sup>1</sup> Wooll notes that he had a statement from John Warton that the information he had given Mant was 'not correct beyond Mr. A. Warton of Breamore.'<sup>2</sup> Notwithstanding this disclaimer by John Warton, Wooll asserts a connection with Sir Michael Warton of Beverly, Yorkshire, whom he identifies with Michael of Warton-Hall, Lancashire, adding in a footnote that, "It is to the . . . exertions of the ingenious Mr. Dallaway that I owe the accuracy of my information." It appears elsewhere that this 'accurate information' was Mr. Dallaway's assertion that he had seen the Beverly Warton arms on Thos. Warton's seal.

Dependable records afford no ground for connecting the family with the Beverly Wartons. The father of Thos. Warton, Sr., was the Rev. Anthony Warton (1650-1715), who was matriculated at Magdalen College, Oxford, Nov. 2, 1665, as son of Francis Warton, of Breamore, Hants, *pleb.*<sup>3</sup> After holding the livings of Langham, Essex, and North Tidworth, Wilts, he was instituted to the vicarage of Godalming, Surrey (1682), which he held until his death. The descent of the family has not been fixed beyond Francis, grandfather of Thomas, Sr. But there is scarcely a doubt that Francis was the son of Anthony Warton, the author of *Refinement in Sion*. This Anthony Warton was born at Walton, Lancashire, in 1581, matriculated at Lincoln College in 1596, was curate of Hamsey, Sussex, and rector of Breamore, Hants, from 1626 until his death in 1661. His will, preserved in Somerset House, shows that among other children he had a son Francis, who would be of the generation of Francis, father of Anthony of Godalming.<sup>4</sup> Identity of place and names would indicate identity of person, and justify the conclusion that Francis, fath-

<sup>1</sup> The Poetical Works of the Late Thomas Warton, by Richard Mant, Oxford, 1802, Vol. I, p. ix.

<sup>2</sup> Biographical Memoirs of Rev. Joseph Warton, by the Rev. John Wooll, London, 1806, p. 2. Mant and, presumably, John Warton identified A. Warton of Breamore with A. Warton of Godalming, the father of Thos. Warton.

<sup>3</sup> Bloxam's Register of Magdalen College, II, cxv.

<sup>4</sup> Information furnished by Mr. C. J. Hersey of Cheam, Surrey.



er of Anthony of Godalming, was the son of Anthony of Breamore. The objective evidence is further supported. *Refinement in Sion* is a bitter anti-Presbyterian tract. Its vigorous loyalty to the Stuarts in 1657 would show that the Jacobitism of each of the two Thomas Wartons was in the blood.<sup>5</sup>

The matter of relationship to the Beverly Wartons has interest chiefly because the relationship was assumed by the family in the eighteenth century. The Beverly arms are on the tomb of Anthony of Godalming.<sup>6</sup> The seal of Joseph Warton, preserved on the contract between him and Robert Dodsley, shows the same arms.<sup>7</sup> In the *Millard Collection* the 'first verses by T. Warton, Jr.,' have the imperfectly erased imprint of the same seal. As late as June 28, 1788, Thos. Warton, Jr., used the seal on a letter to his Kiddington curate.<sup>8</sup> In the light of the evidence, however, one concludes that this relationship grew from fond conjecture to final assertion. Anthony, of Breamore, could not have been the brother, and certainly not the descendant, of the Sir Michael to whom the arms were granted in 1617.

Thomas Warton, the father of Joseph and Thomas, Jr., was born at Godalming, Surrey, early in the year 1688.<sup>9</sup> He matriculated at Hart Hall, April 9, 1706. From 1706 to 1717 he was demy, 1717-24 fellow, of Magdalen. He proceeded to B. A. 1710; M. A. 1712; B. D. 1725. He was Professor of Poetry at Oxford, 1718-28; vicar of Basingstoke, Hants, 1723-45. He held also the living of Woking, Surrey, 1727-30; and that of Chobham, 1730-45.<sup>10</sup>

Warton had already attempted verse writing when he entered the University; and at least three of his compositions carry evidence of authorship in his first year there. Hearne writes on Jan. 31, 1718: "There is a ballad handed about,

<sup>5</sup> A writer in *Notes and Queries* (8th, ix, 52) calls attention to the fact that there was a Francis of the Beverly Warton family. (See also Scaum's *Beveriac*, London, 1829, insert in Vol. I, p. 499.) He was a son of Laurence of Redness, near Sheffield, who was a brother of Sir Michael, upon whom knighthood was conferred in 1617 (Scaum, *ibid.*). The suggestion that he was the father of Anthony is a bold conjecture. The fact that the first Anthony came from Lancashire might suggest relation to the Wartons of Warton Hall; but Walton, his birth place, is at extreme distance in the county from Carnforth, the site of Warton Hall.

<sup>6</sup> Manning's *History of Surrey*, London, 1804, Vol. I, p. 636.

<sup>7</sup> Additional MSS., British Museum.

<sup>8</sup> Montagu MSS., d. 18, fol. 135, Bodleian.

<sup>9</sup> The parish register shows baptism Feb. 3rd.

<sup>10</sup> Manning's *History of Surrey*, London, 1814, Vol. III, p. 202.

both in MS and in print, called *The Turnip-hoer*. The author is said to be one Mr. Warton, a young Master of Arts of Magdalen College."<sup>11</sup> This was a satire upon King George, who had suggested turning St. James's Park into a turnip patch. Hearne states that Warton had also written verses upon 'King James III,' and offers the opinion that in these Jacobite verses Warton had his eye on the poetry-professorship, soon to be vacated by Trapp. This surmise was justified by the event, for on July 17, 1718, Warton was elected to the position. The opposing candidate, 'Mr. Fiddes, of All Souls,' received 186 votes to Warton's 252. Hearne adds that there was 'vast bustle' over the election, and that votes were sent for far and near.

Warton's Jacobite partisanship made him a target for Nicholas Amhurst's attack in *Terrae Filius*.<sup>12</sup> The quality of Warton's verse hardly merits the recognition given him in this election, but he appears to have maintained himself in university circles, and his first lecture was reported by Hearne as meeting the requirements. Amhurst writes contemptuously of his lectures, but his opinion must be taken as that of a partisan with an angry grievance against Oxford.<sup>13</sup> He is especially resentful of Warton's popularity with the 'Oxford toasts,' and his animus is revealed in the sobriquet he applied to Warton,—'Squinting Tom of Maudlin,' and in an indecent insinuation.<sup>14</sup> We are indebted to him for a full report of a sermon preached by Warton on May 29, 1719, that created no little stir.

In this sermon Warton had set forth the wickedness of England in banishing the rightful king and setting up a usurper. Without specific references, Warton contrived to make the obvious bearing of his sermon relate to Charles I and Cromwell; but it appears evident that the immediate application of his discourse was to the exiled Stuart, the Pretender, and to George I, and that the true purpose of his sermon was revealed in that bearing. Hearne's entry at that time makes no note of

<sup>11</sup> *Remarks and Collections of Thos. Hearne*, Oxford, 1902, Vol. VI, p. 135.

<sup>12</sup> London, 1754, 3rd edition, Nos. x, xv, xvi, xxv.

<sup>13</sup> He had been expelled for libertinism, though he claimed it was for loyalty to the House of Hanover. His style and temper and all his subsequent career reveal him as a disturber and malcontent.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, x.

such implication. He says the sermon 'was honest and good';<sup>15</sup> but his subsequent comments support the conclusion that Warton had intended his sermon to express the Jacobite views then dominant at Oxford.<sup>16</sup> The Hanoverian loyalists at Oxford thought they saw their occasion in this sermon. One Richard Meadowcourt, a fellow of Merton, waited upon the Vice-Chancellor and charged Warton with preaching a seditious sermon. When the Vice-Chancellor denied the accusation and refused to proceed against Warton unless specified charges should be made, Meadowcourt made a written charge asserting that "the general scope and design of his late sermon was to asperse and blacken the administration of his majesty King George by a partial and wretched representation of all the actions and circumstances of the present reign as parallel to what happened during the usurpation of Cromwell."<sup>17</sup> Meadowcourt's charge did not move the Vice-Chancellor, and his threat of reporting to the government was alike ineffectual. This threat was carried out by his writing to 'one of the King's principal Secretaries of State.' The result was an order from the government commanding the Vice-Chancellor to proceed according to statute. Warton was summoned before the Vice-Chancellor and 'six other grave doctors of divinity,' and his notes were demanded. Hearne's entry is, "Warton's sermon was demanded, but he denied that he had it, and took oath that it was purloined from him. Who gave him such advice I know not, but I little thought he would prevaricate." On June 29, two days later, Warton was required to make answer against the charge that his sermon 'tended to raise sedition.' This general charge he denied, but he refused to make oath to his denial unless specific charges should be made.<sup>18</sup> The charge was dismissed, and this ended the matter for Warton; but not for Meadowcourt, who was publicly reprimanded at the end of the year as a 'turbulent informer,' and was suspended from taking his degree for two years.<sup>19</sup>

In July, 1723, the first term of Warton's professorship expired. Trapp, the first incumbent, had held for two terms

<sup>15</sup> *Remarks and Collections*, vii, 14.

<sup>16</sup> Hearne sympathized with these views.

<sup>17</sup> *Terrae Filius*, xvi.

<sup>18</sup> *Remarks and Collections*, vii, 25.

<sup>19</sup> See *European Magazine*, March, 1800, p. 199.

without opposition; but the partisan spirit at Oxford developed vigorous opposition to Warton. A news item from Oxford to *The London Evening Post* of July 13-16 states that he "was opposed with extraordinary zeal by the Constitution Club.<sup>20</sup> Masters of Arts were sent for all over England. . . . The contest was the greatest that ever was known here." Warton's victory was a clear one, as he received 215 votes to 179 cast for Randolph, fellow of All Souls. Hearne states that the result pleased 'honest men,' and adds that Warton has 'the character of a very honest, ingenious, and good-natured man, and nobody looks upon Mr. Randolph's being put up but anything else besides spite.'

Hearne's mild, and rather negative, commendation of Warton's service in his professorship is the only evidence found of his merits in that position. When one remembers the general indolence of Oxford and Cambridge dons in the eighteenth century, he will not assume that Warton improved a scholar's opportunities. He left no product attesting this. However, Amhurst admits that he was exceptional as one of the few professors who gave lectures. There is doubtless foundation for the same writer's report of the 'Poetical Club,' of which Warton was president. In Amhurst's satirical treatment this appears to have been social and convivial in spirit rather than literary. Hearne's testimony to Warton's pleasant social qualities is supported by the indirect evidence in Amhurst's resentment of his popularity with the 'Oxford toasts.'

In 1723 Thos. Warton was instituted as vicar of Basingstoke, Hants, to which he was presented by his college. He moved there directly, and was not again in residence at Oxford, though he held the professorship to the close of his term. Early in 1721 he had married Elizabeth, second daughter of the Rev. Joseph Richardson,<sup>21</sup> rector of Dunsfold, Surrey, and

<sup>20</sup> A loyalist Whig organization. See *Terrae Filius*, *passim*.

<sup>21</sup> The following letter is in the possession of Miss Margaret Lee, of Waltham Abbey, whose kindness has permitted me to see it.  
*For the Reverend Mr. Thomas Warton at Nando's Coffee House, near Temple Bar, London.*

DEAR Sir,

DUNSFOLD, Dec. 19th, 1720.  
Yesterday in the Afternoon I recd your long Letter, to which I return this short answer, that since I find you and my Dr. are engaged one to another, and that you say you can not be at Ease and settle to any business, till you be married, I freely give my Consent that you consummate the matter as soon as you can meet with a fitting Opportunity.

Which, with my kind Respects and Services is all in hast from  
Your most humble Srvt.

JOS RICHARDSON

My wife continues well and all here give their Services to you.

Elizabeth (*née* Peebles) Richardson. It appears that his attractiveness among the ladies, imputed to him by Amhurst, engaged him in the graces of the parents of this young lady.

In addition to holding the vicarage of Basingstoke and the successive livings of Woking and Chobham, Warton was also the headmaster of the Basingstoke grammar school.<sup>22</sup> In 1738 he was elected to a lectureship in Basingstoke that had been established for the 'maintenance of a good and learned preacher,' who was to 'instruct the people in the principles of religion.' The honorarium was £50.<sup>23</sup> He held this lectureship until his death. In the strict regulations defining the obligations of the office, passed by the corporation before his successor was chosen, may be found a suggestion that Warton had been slack in his duties. His conservatism, manifested in his Jacobitism at Oxford, is further evidenced in the protest he made to the town clerk in 1739 against the conduct of the Rev. Mr. Kinchin, rector of Dummer, who had held public meetings at the Crown Inn, and had "preached and prayed *much extempore* after the manner of the Methodists." He included George Whitfield in his protest, stating that Whitfield had preached in the same manner at the King's Head, adding that 'inns are not licensed for such purposes.' An indication of his connection with public affairs is found in the fact that he was one of the trustees on the repairs of roads in Hampshire in 1737.<sup>24</sup> No further records of his life in Basingstoke have been found, save an account by Mant of a visit he made with his two boys, Joseph and Thos., Jr., to Windsor Castle.<sup>25</sup> It would appear that Warton's income from his livings, the lectureship, and the school would have been adequate for the demands of his family, but it seems that he was in pressing financial circumstances when his son Joseph was at Oxford.<sup>26</sup> He left debts which gave Joseph his chief motive for publish-

<sup>22</sup> Among his pupils there was Gilbert White, who has left a record of depredations he and his schoolfellows committed on 'the fine old ruin known as Holy Ghost Chapel.' (*Antiquities of Selborne*, chapt. xxvi.)

<sup>23</sup> Millard's *History of Basingstoke*, London, 1889.

<sup>24</sup> Woodward's *History of Hampshire*, London (no date), Vol. III, p. 238.

<sup>25</sup> *The Poetical Works of Thomas Warton*, I, xxix. The interest there manifested in architecture has some significance in the light of Thomas Warton, Jr.'s, antiquarian researches in architecture. (See Miss Clarissa Rinaker's *Thomas Warton, a Biographical and Critical Study*, Urbana, 1916, chapt. x.)

<sup>26</sup> Woolf, p. 213.

ing the poems left by him.<sup>27</sup> He died on the 10th of Sept., 1745, and was buried in the Basingstoke church.<sup>28</sup>

No collection of Warton's verses appeared during his life.<sup>29</sup> Two years after his death Joseph Warton collected and published his father's poems in an octavo volume of 228 pages, including fifty-seven different titles. (*Poems on Several Occasions*, London, 1747.) The evidence indicates that most of these poems were written before Warton went to Basingstoke. Of eleven indicating either by allusion or title the time of composition, nine belong to his Oxford residence. *A Farewell to Poetry*, written at the time of his departure, shows that he purposed not to write further verse. Remembering the numerous responsibilities that gathered upon him, it seems probable that he wrote little after that time. So far as his work has interest, the evidence of its composition in the first quarter of the eighteenth century adds to that interest.

Difficult as it is to determine the relative merit of the work of the greater poets, it seems even a less simple matter to assign comparative values to such mediocre poets as fill the collected editions from Dodsley's to Chalmers's. One may venture to say, however, that the first Warton's best verse is above the average published in eighteenth century collections. However, it is not the intrinsic merit of his work that invites our interest, but the fact that writing in the hey-day of Pope he so early gave evidence of the changing taste that was to support the romantic revolt in which his two sons were to have conspicuous part. In the conventional moralizing of his poetry and in his diction, he is quite of his time; but when the heroic couplet was the almost exclusive poetic form, scarcely more than a third of his poems adopt that measure. The larger remainder are regular odes in octosyllabic couplets, irregular odes, or in blank verse. As to the subject character of his volume of 1747, the poems are occasional, chiefly with a satirical or *vers de société* quality; verse epistles; paraphrases or translations from Hebrew or classic literature; and poems that may be

<sup>27</sup> See below, and Wooll, p. 214.

<sup>28</sup> The memorial erected to him in the church was subsequently displaced in the repairing of the church. In the nineteenth century descendants of Joseph Warton placed a tablet in the chancel to record this earlier memorial. It bears no coat of arms.

<sup>29</sup> In addition to Hearne's allusions above, which may refer to verses in MS., Amburst writes: "Except a few dull verses in print, all the productions I have seen of his are 'The Hanover Turnip,' 'Verses upon the Chevalier's Picture,' and 'Verses upon the death of the young prince.'" (*Terrae Filius*, x.)

said to owe such inspiration as they manifest to nature. The last show an interest in and love for rural scenes that was certainly not usual in the first quarter of the eighteenth century. In such verses as *Retirement* and *An Ode [on Ludlow's Cave]* there are delicately touched passages that show where the Warton brothers got their tastes.<sup>30</sup> The volume contains an imitation of Chaucer's *Parlement of Foules*<sup>31</sup> that faintly echoes the quaintness of the master, though Warton knew no more of Chaucer's versification than did Pope. More interesting, perhaps, is his imitation of Spenser in the elegy *Philander*, on the death of William Levinz. It is one of the earliest of Spenserian imitations. If not the first in the eighteenth century, it shares that distinction with Prior's *Ode to the Queen*, published in 1706, the year of the composition of Warton's lines. Though it is a poor imitation and a poor poem, the early date gives it claim for mention.<sup>32</sup>

In Warton's Oxford days he seems to have been known chiefly for his satirical and epigrammatic verse. His son, as usual most prudent, did not include any of the verses referred to by Hearne or Amhurst. The best expression of his satire is found in his vigorous arraignment of Robert Walpole and lament for Britain 'bent under his corruptive power',—

"Debauched, like Danæ, with a golden shower."<sup>33</sup>

Tradition has divided between Trapp and Warton the title to authorship of the epigram on George I's respective gifts to Oxford and Cambridge.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Six poems are directly due to inspiration from country scenes. Allusions in others support the evidence these afford.

<sup>31</sup> Thus introduced: "Hereafter in English Metre ensueth A Paraphrase on the Holle Book entituled Leviticus, Chap. xi, vers. 13, &c. Fashioned after the Maniere of Maister Geoffrey Chaucer in his Assemlie of Foules."

<sup>32</sup> Professor Phelps (*The Beginnings of the English Romantic Movement*, p. 72) does not accept the date of Levinz's death as establishing the time of authorship. But the youthful crudeness of the elegy, the allusions of the poet to an immediate loss, and the fact that Warton had written verse before this and other verse in this year, all support the natural inference that the poem was written directly after Levinz's death, which occurred on Nov. 3, 1706. (See Bloxam's Register, vi, 152.)

<sup>33</sup> "To Sir Robert Walpole." *Poems on Several Occasions*, p. 47.

<sup>34</sup> *Biographical Dictionary*, London, 1798, assigns to Warton. The epigram is written on a fly leaf of the copy of *Terrae Filius* in the British Museum, edition of 1726. The handwriting appears to be of the period. The lines follow:

"The King observing with judicious eyes

The state of both his universities

To one a regiment he sent; but why?

That learned body wanted loyalty.

To th' other books he gave, as well discerning,

That loyal body wanted learning."

The books were the library of a great collector, Bishop John Moore, who died in 1714. They were purchased by George I and presented to Cambridge shortly after his death.



The elder Warton was a friend of Elijah Fenton, with whom he corresponded. The single letter preserved of this correspondence indicates that he had, at least, the relation of acquaintanceship with the notorious Henry Sacheverell and with John Philips, "Pomona's bard."<sup>35</sup> It appears also that Joseph Warton's adoption of Young as a patron, in dedicating to him his *Essay on Pope*, was due to a friendship that had existed between his father and that poet.<sup>36</sup> The first poem in *Poems on Several Occasions* was an epistle to Young.<sup>37</sup> Joseph Warton states that there was an intimate friendship between his father and the Hon. Robert Digby, Pope's devoted friend.<sup>38</sup> Through Digby he made the acquaintance of Pope, who wrote that Warton had pressed his copy of *Gorboduc* upon him.<sup>39</sup> This chance evidence of Warton's quite exceptional interest in early literature is most interesting. The assertion by Thomas Warton, Jr.,<sup>40</sup> that through Digby his father first directed Pope's attention to the minor poems of Milton is probably one of the surmises to which both Joseph and Thomas, Jr., were rather too liable.<sup>41</sup>

The father of the Wartons now receives mention only for that relationship. I have found no evidence of general recognition being given him in the eighteenth century. His volume of poems was published just before Dodsley was to give increased popularity to "collections" of verse. That enterprising publisher and his followers found no lack of such material as supplied their pages from the pens of living poets; so the

<sup>35</sup> Wooll, p. 203.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 218.

<sup>37</sup> This had been printed in "Poems on Divine and Moral Subjects By Dr. Patrick, late Bishop of Ely, and other eminent hands." London, 1719.

<sup>38</sup> See *Works of Alex. Pope*, by Joseph Warton, Vol. VIII, p. 40.

<sup>39</sup> Professor Courthope makes an observation that happens to be interesting in this connection. He notes that Digby had an intense love for the country; and, further, that in two letters to Digby "are to be found the two passages in Pope's writings which disclose the most genuinely poetical feeling for nature." (See Elwin and Courthope's *Works of Pope*, Vol. V, p. 209.)

<sup>40</sup> June 2, 1717. *Ibid.* The book was passed on to Atterbury, who wrote Pope in regard to it, Feb. 18, 1718. In reading this play Pope discovered Dryden's error in referring to *Gorboduc* as a queen, and was indignant "that men should write with contempt of a piece which they never once saw."

<sup>41</sup> *Milton's Poems . . . with notes . . .* by Thos. Warton, London, 1785, p. viii.

<sup>42</sup> Professor Ker accepts this statement. (See *Warton Lecture on English Poetry*. I. Thomas Warton, London, 1911.) From Pope's letter to Sir William Trumbull on Oct. 19, 1705, it is quite clear that Pope is sending a copy of Milton's minor poems to Trumbull. To be sure, this letter was subjected to Pope's editing for the 1737 edition of his letters, and there is no knowing to what extent changes may have been introduced. If the date is correct, then Pope knew Milton's minor poems before he met Thomas Warton. (See Elwin and Courthope's *Pope*, VI, 2.)



elder Warton is not represented in those anthologies where his sons found place.<sup>42</sup> There is evidence that both Gray and Johnson owed something to him in special instances.<sup>43</sup> Warton begins his "*Universal Love of Pleasure*" with the lines—

"All human race from China to Peru,  
Pleasure, howe'er disguised by art, pursue."

This is perhaps the worst couplet in a poor poem, but it must have lodged in Dr. Johnson's memory to reappear in the opening lines of "*The Vanity of Human Wishes*,"—

"Let observation with extensive view  
Survey mankind from China to Peru."

More interesting is the fact that among Warton's poems there were two 'Runic Odes.' He had seen the Latin rendering of these by Olaus Wormius in the works of Sir William Temple.<sup>44</sup> The same metrical form and a kindred tone are found in the fragments of poems written from the Norse by Gray. That Warton should have written verse so unusual in theme and source suggests an interest in unconventional literary subjects more considerable than his collected poems alone would indicate. It seems no mere accident that he should have anticipated Gray by probably thirty years.

The sons were pupils of their father in the Basingstoke school. It is clear, too, that they were close companions and congenial friends,<sup>45</sup> and that the father continued in close touch with their work after they went to the University. Joseph Warton paid apt tribute to this close association in the phrase from Horace which he chose for the title page of his father's poems: "*Nec luisse pudet*." It seems most probable that Joseph and Thomas Warton, Jr., owed their advanced tastes

<sup>42</sup> In 1780 when John Nichols was contemplating additional publications of 'Miscellaneous Poems,' he questioned Joseph Warton about selecting something from his father's volume. Joseph Warton replied, "I must now *earnestly* entreat you for many strong reasons, not to select anything out of the collection you mention of my father's. [Italics sic.] And I am sure you will oblige me by believing that I do not ask this without reason." (Nichols' *Literary Anecdotes*, VI, 171.)

<sup>43</sup> This statement has come to be the *locus classicus* in regard to Thomas Warton. I think attention has not been called to the circumstance that Johnson's borrowing appears the more direct because, following Warton, he refers to Charles of Sweden as a type of the ambitious ruler.

<sup>44</sup> Edition of 1720, Vol. I, p. 216.

<sup>45</sup> See Wooll, pp. 8, 212; and Mant, I, xxix.

and their interest in romantic themes more largely to their father than to any other single influence. He doubtless developed their taste and love for the shorter poems of Milton. In his *Retirement*, and in passages here and there throughout his poems, he set them the example of imitating him. The *Ode to Taste*, one of his best poems, is written in the unusual metrical form of Milton's *Fifth Ode of Horace*. He thus anticipated Collins in borrowing the form that the latter poet made unforgettable in his *Ode to Evening*. It was no mere *il Penseroso* affectation that led the Wartons to express a love for nature and country quiet. Their feeling was unmistakably genuine, and it finds repeated expression in the verse of the father. So that, withal, though the elder Warton could not attain to the sweet excellence of Thomson, or even to the free utterance and romantic spirit of the author of *Grongar Hill*, it should not be forgotten that he felt and wrote slightly earlier what they excelled him in expressing. His *Ode to Sleep* is one of his creditable poems. As his poetry is not easily accessible I venture to conclude this sketch with a few lines from it:

"O gentle, feather-footed sleep,  
In drowsy dews my temples steep,  
Softly waving o'er my head  
Thy care-beguiling rod of lead:  
O leave thy bed of balmy flowers  
And waken all thy dewy powers,  
And, wafted on the silent wing,  
The dreams, thy little people bring."

In Miltonic fashion the poet dismisses "Sobbing Grief and Midnight Feast" and prays that—

"Whispering showers from off the eaves  
Softly dripping on the leaves,  
Mixed with the mildly stirring wind,  
Shall woo to rest my weary mind."

## BOOK REVIEWS

THE PRINCE OF PARTHIA, A TRAGEDY. By Thomas Godfrey. Edited with Introduction, Historical, Biographical and Critical, by Archibald Henderson. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1917,—189 pp.

It is interesting and most encouraging to those, who are working in the neglected field of our native drama, that the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the production of *The Prince of Parthia* should be celebrated by two critical reprints of our first native play. Professor Henderson's edition, which is the second to appear, is accompanied by an introduction which brings together the material previously known of Godfrey and adds some very interesting facts concerning the dramatist's stay in North Carolina.

Professor Henderson naturally begins with an account of Godfrey's ancestry and education, for it was due to his environment in Philadelphia that he wrote *The Prince of Parthia*. The son of a glazier of considerable scientific attainments, Thomas Godfrey was educated at an English School which the editor rightly concludes to have been in all probability the Charity School out of which grew the University of Pennsylvania. Godfrey was a pupil of Provost William Smith, the leader of literary interest in the city of Philadelphia, who gathered around him a group of young men who were afterwards to make history. When we consider that one of them, Benjamin West, was our first great painter, another, Francis Hopkinson was our first poet-composer of music, and that still another, Godfrey, was our first dramatist, it gives a clear indication as to the city and the college to which America owes the beginnings of three of the arts. Professor Henderson has enriched his volume with illustrations and we find here the reproduction of Leffert's painting of the "College, Academy and Charitable School of Philadelphia," under whose influence Godfrey grew up. Here also he knew Nathaniel Evans, himself a poet, who in 1765 published his friend's poems with an introduction, giving an account of Godfrey, derived in part

from Provost Smith's account published earlier in the *American Magazine*.

What is of most interest to us is the source of the inspiration which led Godfrey to write his play. Professor Henderson naturally calls attention to the opportunities Godfrey had of witnessing the performances of Murray and Kean's Company and later of Lewis Hallam's Company in Philadelphia, more especially since the latter gave a benefit for the Charity School connected with the Academy on June 19, 1754.

An equally strong influence upon Godfrey, which has not as yet been indicated, was the production of the masques and dramatic odes and dialogues which took place at the College of Philadelphia. The earliest of these of which we have record was the *Masque of Alfred*, adapted from the English original by Francis Hopkinson and produced in the College Hall during the Christmas vacation of 1756-57. The Masque, which contains over two hundred lines by Hopkinson, is probably the first dramatic composition produced by American college students that includes original material and it is almost certain that Godfrey took part in it. His participation in this early dramatic activity was represented concretely in an appealing way by the introduction of the character of "Thomas Godfrey" in the *Masque of American Drama* produced by the Zelosophic and Philomathean Societies of the University of Pennsylvania in May, 1917. The "Godfrey Dance Chorus," participated in by about sixty students, which preceded the production of the pantomime representation of the play itself, culminated in the triumphant carrying off the stage of the dramatist by his fellow students, all clad in the costume of the time.

With the impulses fostered by this close association with the beginnings of theatrical interest, professional and amateur, in this country, Godfrey left Philadelphia to seek his fortune in North Carolina. Here he finished *The Prince of Parthia*, and sent his play to a friend, probably Dr. Smith, for presentation to the reorganized American Company, under David Douglass. Professor Henderson gives a most interesting account of the social and intellectual life in North Carolina, and especi-

ally in Wilmington where Godfrey went as a factor in the spring of 1759, where he spent three years and where he died in 1763. It was evidently a society in which education was fostered and the production of literature encouraged. The natural beauty of the scenery, too, had its effect on Godfrey, for more than one of his shorter poems was inspired by it. Professor Henderson gives a portrait of Masonboro Sound, which inspired Godfrey's *Fifth Song*, and which was situated in the neighborhood in which *The Prince of Parthia* was completed. During his stay here, Godfrey contributed several poems to the *American Magazine*, edited by his friend Provost Smith, in Philadelphia, and some of these were copied in the *Monthly Review* in London. After Godfrey's death in 1763, his friends in Wilmington were instrumental in collecting his manuscript poems and sending them to Philadelphia for publication.

Professor Henderson takes up in detail the circumstances of the first production of the play at the Southwark Theatre in Philadelphia by the American Company on April 24, 1767, and its first certain revival, that by the Zelosophic Society of the University of Pennsylvania on March 26, 1915. He has fortunately given a photograph of the costumes, especially designed for that performance by Mr. Guernsey Moore, although of course the brilliancy of the coloring has not been reproduced. The evidence which Professor Henderson brings forth, concerning the possibility of the play's having been performed in Wilmington, N. C., in 1847, seems rather inconclusive, but there is a possibility that it was given at that time.

Professor Henderson presents in a scholarly way the sources of the play in Parthian history, showing that Godfrey was indebted to it for little but the names of the characters. His sources were rather the plays of Shakespeare and of Dryden, and there are very definite echoes even of particular lines, some of which the editor points out. There is no doubt that Godfrey studied with care the masterpieces of his art, just as any craftsman would do. But this fact does not militate against the significance of his work. He gave to our dramatic literature a dignified beginning, comparable, without apology, to what was being done in England in 1759. Certainly every-

one interested in our literature owes a debt to Professor Henderson for the labor and critical insight which resulted in this edition of the first American play.

ARTHUR HOBSON QUINN.

University of Pennsylvania.

---

PORTRAITS OF WOMEN. By Gamaliel Bradford. Illustrated. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1916,—202 pp. \$2.50 net.

A writer in a recent periodical complained in respect to biographies that most of them regard only external matters, dates and catalogues of events, giving slight attention to the inner lives of their subjects, the half hidden ideals and motives—"ghosts" she calls them—that shape the personality. Against Mr. Bradford's biographical sketches the charge does not hold. Of outward events there is little given; indeed there is place for little in these charming twenty-page portraits. Yet, in this brief space, is set down so much of what these women *were*, of their ideas, their temper, their reigning motives, their manner of relation with their fellow-men, that we finish, not indeed with any extended knowledge of their history, but with a sympathetic understanding of the good ladies themselves. And if, as the writer above mentioned avers, the first essential in a biographer is a love for the subject of the essay, surely this quality is found in Mr. Bradford's sympathetic treatment of women as different as Lady Holland and Madame du Deffand and Eugénie de Guérin. Perhaps it is with some idea that love is a requisite of biography that he has selected his subjects, for they are all lovable women or at least women with many and strong lovable traits—even Lady Holland.

To a large extent the nine women of the volume are allowed to plead their own cause through their letters and journals. Only Mrs. Pepys, of the nine, depends altogether upon the testimony of others—in her case, of course, the loquacious Samuel. The women of her novels do some valuable service for Miss Austen; but for the most part the characterization springs from the records left by the subject herself, supplemented by the comment of more or less penetrating acquaintances. It is invariably upon this evidence in the first person

that the author puts most reliance, and it is by means of this that he discovers the tender, womanly touches in women whom their contemporaries deemed harsh, masculine, and overbearing—notably Lady Holland and Lady Montagu.

Most of the nine represent the eighteenth and late seventeenth centuries. All are either English or French. The portraits of these individual lives give some interesting hints of states of mind in their respective countries and periods. For to know what these women, most of them representative, thought of their fellow-men, of life, of God, is to know what society thought.

Perhaps what most surprises one is to learn how small a part religion played in their lives. If we except the mystic, Eugénie de Guérin, not one of the nine seems to have been seriously religious. To Lady Montagu God meant "little or nothing." Lady Holland's characteristic prayer addressed itself thus: "Oh, God! chance, nature, or whatever thou art." Miss Austen was as frankly cynical toward religion as toward the rest of life. Fanny Burney was ready "to look up to somebody else for her thinking." With Madame de Choiseul, "My scepticism has grown so great that it falls over backward and from doubting everything I have become ready to believe everything. For instance, I believe just as much in Blue Beard, the Thousand and One Nights, genii, fairies, sorcerers, and will-o'-the-wisps, as in—what shall I say?—anything you please." And all but one appear to have been quite content in their lack of faith. Madame du Deffand was quite the opposite: "Everything that exists is wretched, an angel, an oyster, perhaps even a grain of sand; nothingness, nothingness, what better can we have to pray for?"

It would be interesting, if space and the data here found permitted, to examine what these gifted women thought of democracy, of "women's rights," of other social and political problems. Such an inquiry would be beyond the scope of this review. I cannot forbear, however, to quote the curiously concurrent opinions of two of them on the subject of female education—opinions interestingly at variance with those of our twentieth century, whether or not there may be still some basis for them in twentieth century facts. Lady Mary Wortley Mon-

tagu writes of her granddaughter: "The second caution to be given her is to conceal whatever learning she attains, with as much solicitude as she would hide crookedness or lameness; the parade of it can only serve to draw on her the envy, and consequently the most inveterate hatred, of all he and she fools, which will certainly be at least three parts in four of all her acquaintance." And Miss Austen, writing at least a half century later, was even more outspoken: "Where people wish to attach, they should always be ignorant. To come with a well-informed mind is to come with an inability of administering to the vanity of others, which a sensible person would always wish to avoid. A woman, especially, if she have the misfortune of knowing anything, should conceal it as well as she can."

It is in part to the wealth and wise selection of such "source material" as this that the volume owes its charm. A greater part, however, it owes to the self-effacing sympathy of the author, to his careful probing of the depths of personality, and to his agreeable style.

JULIUS W. PRATT.

U. S. Naval Academy.

---

ENGLISH BIOGRAPHY. By Waldo H. Dunn. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1916,—xxi, 323 pp. \$1.50.

A new essay in the history of literature might be read with pleasure and reviewed with praise by even the most aesthetically self-centered of impressionistic critics, if the essay came from the pen of such a stylist as the great professor of Edinburgh. But Professor Dunn is not a genius of that sort, and probably a reviewer after the order of Swinburne would be able to record few pleasant reactions accompanying his perusal of the preface and a part of the first chapter of "English Biography." In fact the book is a source of disappointment to the reader who expected to enjoy reading it. The title promises well; there is witchery in the records of men's lives, and an enchantment in the thought of an appreciative survey of all the life-records in our language. But the Dunn volume is thick and forbidding; the very texture of the pages speaks of



crisp philological dryness; the "human interest" appeal of the treatise begins and ends with its title.

Yet this book is a sturdy pioneer in rich territory. For general information and bibliographical suggestion, students will find it invaluable. The author has investigated a broad field thoroughly and marshaled in moderate compass a great number of facts. He has written a plain history of English biography from Adamnan's short *Life of St. Columba* to Horace Traubel's three volumes of his experiences *With Walt Whitman in Camden*. The progressive development of the genre, he demonstrates with firm optimism by judging the merits of each example "in proportion to the degree of accuracy attained in the presentation of mere facts, the measure of its detachment from panegyric or other didactic intention; and the extent to which it recognizes truth of character portrayal as its first duty." The definite separation of history and biography he notes as marking the beginning of modern life-writing. And he pitches upon Boswell's *Johnson* as the standard of excellence.

Several sections in this perfectibilitarian history of British biography merit special comment. The chapter upon "English Verse Lives," for instance, presents a difficult subject succinctly, with helpful illustration in the quotation of one complete poem and extensive selections from another. Likewise the two chapters on Autobiography are pleasantly instructive. By frequent references, they recommend Mrs. A. R. Burr's authoritative work, *The Autobiography*. In the first of these two chapters, the Life of Lord Herbert of Cherbury is accorded praise which may with difficulty be reconciled with the assertion, in the Introduction, that "autobiography did not assume an important place in English until the latter part of the eighteenth century." Diaries, too, such as that of Samuel Pepys (who is mentioned in the text of "English Biography" but not in the index) contain autobiographical elements, the importance of which seems underestimated. Perhaps, however, before it is put into print, a kind of writing cannot assume an important place in its language. The chapter called "A Comparative View" is of considerable worth for its glance at the history of biography in the whole world of letters. But

Professor Dunn is at his best in discussing the "New Beginnings in English" in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and particularly in his sympathetic appreciation of John Aubrey.

ROBERT CALVIN WHITFORD.

University of Illinois.

---

CHARLES THE TWELFTH, KING OF SWEDEN. TRANSLATED FROM THE MANUSCRIPT OF CARL GUSTAFSON KLINGSPO. By John A. Gade. With illustrations. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1916,—xv, 371 pp. \$3.00 net.

The author of this interesting volume apparently decided that the story of the life of the dashing young king of Sweden would find more readers if told in a style reminiscent of the time in which he lived. Accordingly, he invented a fabulous Colonel Klingspor, an officer in the corps of Drabants, to accompany the heroic prince on his many adventures as an intimate companion. The reader is given a circumstantial introduction to this fictitious narrator in a prefatory note. Because of his habit of "speaking freely and fearlessly of all that led to Sweden's ruin," we are told, he found Stockholm an unwelcome abode in his old age. "And so, with an almost unequaled collection of letters and memoirs at his disposal as well as a remarkable memory of all that he had seen, the Colonel sat down in his last days and rewrote or interleaved the earlier pages of the diary he had always faithfully kept."

Having given his work this fictitious character, the author sought to emphasize it further by putting his narrative into archaic English, as nearly as possible reproducing the style of the writers who were contemporaries of the fabulous colonel. The resulting story has a certain charm both because of the nature of the events that are described and the quaintness of the manner in which it is told.

One wonders, however, whether the scheme is altogether satisfactory. Would it not have been better to give the book more frankly the character of fiction? Else, one could have wished for a serious account of the life of the young king, which the author might well have written. Nevertheless,

taken as it is, the book is amply worth the short time required to read it, if one is interested in royal adventures.

WILLIAM THOMAS LAPRADE.

---

THE NATIONAL BUDGET SYSTEM. By Charles Wallace Collins. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917,—vi, 151 pp. \$1.25.

In these war times, when nobody in Washington speaks of less than a million and Congress appropriates hundreds of millions for aeroplanes or submarines or destroyers with perhaps a few minutes discussion, talk of a budget system may seem rather dull and prosy. But when the cost of running the government has been permanently increased and burdensome taxes have to be borne, the matter will doubtless seem of greater importance.

Mr. Collins ably explains the system—or lack of system—in appropriating the public moneys in the United States. He also lucidly presents the proper steps in the preparation, ratification, and execution of a well-ordered budget, drawing upon foreign countries for his illustrations. An important chapter is that dealing with the legal and constitutional questions involved in the adoption of a proper budget system in the United States. Some students of the question have found difficulties at this point such as would, in their opinion, necessitate a constitutional amendment. Mr. Collins believes that the sort of budget system he outlines could be put into operation without a constitutional amendment, but that such an amendment, properly drawn, would give to the system greater permanence. As Mr. Collins points out, the leading political parties and statesmen of the United States have expressed themselves favorably to the adoption of a budget system, and the time seems ripe for definite progress to be made in this direction.

For details the reader is referred to the clear and comprehensive information contained in Mr. Collins's excellent book. It is to be hoped that the very confusion and lavishness in public appropriations and expenditures in war time may impress upon the leaders of Congress the need for fiscal reform.

THE MEXICAN PROBLEM. By C. W. Barron. With a preface by Talcott Williams. With illustrations. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1917,—xxix, 136 pp. \$1.00 net.

Mr. C. W. Barron has recently made a trip through Mexico and written for his financial newspapers a series of letters on economic and political conditions in that country. Incidentally he gives some valuable advertising to American petroleum companies operating in Mexico. These letters have been gathered into a very readable and informing book.

Mr. Barron takes the transformation wrought in the condition of the Mexican laborers in the oil regions around Tampico as an illustration of what American and European capital and organization can do for the economic and political redemption of Mexico. He says that the need of Mexico today is "opportunity to labor, opportunity for the family, opportunity for food, clothing, better shelter, and better social conditions." And he believes that the development of Mexico by big business interests will achieve far more for the securing of freedom and happiness and good order for the people of Mexico than can possibly be accomplished in any other way.

## NOTES AND NEWS

The Houghton Mifflin Company has recently published some small volumes devoted to the operations of the British army and navy in the present war. One of these is a concise account of "The Retreat from Mons." Field-Marshal Viscount French contributes a preface to this narrative in which he pays a tribute to the steadiness, endurance, and extraordinary marching powers displayed by the British forces in their difficult retreat. Another volume is devoted to "The British Navy at War." Its author is Professor W. MacNeile Dixon, of the University of Glasgow. Professor Dixon enjoyed unusual facilities for collecting authentic information on his subject, and he has given a graphic description of the Jutland Sea Fight, and of other engagements in which the British Navy has participated. The volume contains maps and illustrations, and also special chapters on "Submarines" and "Blockade and Bombardment." One point especially emphasized is the service performed by the navy in aid of the conquest of the German colonial possessions. Fifty cents net and seventy-five cents net.

---

The Russell Sage Foundation has recently made a contribution to wartime literature in the form of a book on "Munition Makers." The work is divided into two parts. Amy Hewes contributes a study of "Women as Munition Makers," which deals with conditions in Bridgeport, Connecticut. The second part of the volume contains a summary by Henriette R. Walker, of reports issued by the British Ministry of Munitions, with the title "Munition Workers in England and France." The facts presented in these essays are of great importance to the United States in the efficient conduct of the war. European experience has demonstrated that excessive hours of labor actually decrease the output. On the other hand, the maintenance of proper protection of workers against accident and disease is necessary in order that production may be most successfully carried on. New York, The Russell Sage Foundation. Seventy-five cents net.

Dr. George C. Keidel, Late Associate in Romance, Johns Hopkins University, has recently had privately printed a paper on "The Early Life of Professor Elliott." Professor A. M. Elliott was connected with Johns Hopkins University from 1876 to 1910. He was born near Elizabeth City, North Carolina, on January 26, 1844, of Quaker parentage. Dr. Keidel's essay is an interesting account of the early life of this Romance scholar in North Carolina, of his escape from the Confederacy to avoid conscription, of his education at Haverford College and Harvard, and of his adventures and studies in Europe. Washington, D. C., George C. Keidel, Library of Congress.

---

The United States Department of Agriculture has recently published a valuable bulletin on "Coöperative Purchasing and Marketing Organizations among Farmers in the United States," by Messrs. O. B. Jesness and W. H. Kerr. This pamphlet was prepared under the direction of the Office of Markets and Rural Organization. It contains detailed information with regard to the operation of the most important coöperative associations in various sections of the country. A valuable feature of the bulletin is a digest of state coöperative laws and a selected list of publications on coöperative purchasing and marketing.

The eleventh annual report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is largely devoted to the subject of insurance and annuities for teachers, with especial reference to the plan recently proposed by the Foundation. Other subjects discussed in the report are "Pensions for Public School Teachers," "New York City Pensions," "The Study of Legal Education," and "College Entrance Certificates."

---

The Department of Child-helping of the Russell Sage Foundation has recently published a study entitled "Infant Mortality: Its Relation to Social and Industrial Conditions," by Henry H. Hibbs, Jr. Mr. Hibbs's book is a substantial and scholarly piece of work. Many of the chapters have been previously published as articles in scientific journals. The study will be of value to social workers in all parts of the country. Russell Sage Foundation, 130 East Twenty-second Street, New York City. Price thirty cents.

# Velvet

THE  
SMOOTHE.  
TOBACCO

COME, boys, a cheer—All together—V-E-L-V-E-T—smooth.

Velvet cheers you on and cheers you up. It's so smooth. The selected leaf is hung in the warehouse over two years—changing harshness to complete mellowness. Then all "bite" has disappeared—and good taste and the enjoyable smoothness are pre-eminent. This "time process" is not patented—just costs us more—and the result is "Velvet"—smooth and wonderfully pleasing.

Now once more—everybody—V-E-L-V-E-T—smooth! At all dealers.

*Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co.*



10<sup>c</sup>

Full Two  
Ounce Tins





## Keep a-going!



We are all praise for the fellow who can win! By the by, you fellows started a winner a few years ago. We first offered Fatima Cigarettes for sale in the college towns. We put excellent tobacco in this smoke—we watched you! Quick enough you discovered them, and that the tobacco was likable, and from this small beginning they have "kept going" all over this big country until today they are the biggest selling cigarette in the U. S. A.!

Plain package, but 20 choice ones.

*Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co.*

**20 for 15¢**

"Distinctively Individual"

**FATIMA**  
TURKISH BLEND  
CIGARETTES







